

Also, petition of citizens of South Knoxville, Tenn., relative to alcoholic trade in Africa, and to prevent the sale of opium, intoxicants, etc., to undeveloped and child-like races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts: Petition of Women's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Boston, Mass., and Rockland (Mass.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Allegheny County Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Allegheny, Pa., Mrs. H. H. Forrest, president, favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Westport, Mass., favoring the passage of the Gillett and Littlefield bills for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GROW: Petition of Mrs. Eliza Y. Henderson and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., and vicinity, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of Baptist Ministerial Union of San Francisco, Cal., and vicinity, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of F. M. Castetter, of Blair, Nebr., with reference to revenue reduction—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of National Bank Cashiers' Association, Boston, Mass., against taxing bank capital and against stamp tax on bank checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Taggers' National Protective Association of Boston, Mass., for increase of salaries and other measures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Petition of Elizabeth A. Smith, of Florence, Ala., for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of John D. Chadwick, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of John Young, of Loudoun County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Ketland, of Alexandria, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: Petition of Iron Molders' Union, No. 13, of Buffalo, N. Y., for irrigation of arid lands, and Government to give title to none but actual settlers on any public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WILSON of Idaho: Petition of Woman's Relief Corps, No. 5, Department of Idaho, Grand Army of the Republic, asking that a branch of the National Soldiers' Home be established at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 14, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. PRITCHARD, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings filed by the clerk in the cause of Joel G. Higgins, administrator of Richard Higgins, deceased, vs. The United States; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

✓ EVENING SESSION ON DISTRICT CODE BILL.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate shall take a recess from 5.30 this afternoon until 8 o'clock this evening, the evening session to be for the purpose of reading the District code bill, no amendments or other matters to be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that at 5.30 the Senate shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, the evening session to be for the purpose of reading the bill known as the District code bill, no amendments to be acted upon and no other business to be transacted.

Mr. TELLER. I did not understand what is to be read this evening.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The District code bill.

Mr. TELLER. I thought it was read last night?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading was not completed last night. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 854) for the relief of Lieut. Horace P. McIntosh;

A bill (S. 5023) to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate-transportation act to New Bedford, Mass.;

A bill (S. 5364) to establish a light and fog station at Point Dume, Los Angeles County, Cal.;

A bill (S. 5404) to extend the privileges provided by an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, as amended; and

A bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 12258. An act granting a pension to John H. Doremus; and

H. R. 13058. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezra S. Pierce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THURSTON presented sundry petitions of citizens of Wakefield, Blair, Alma, Linwood, Osmond, Waverly, Murdock, Cedar Bluffs, Danbury, Omaha, Westpoint, and Brock, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the repeal of the revenue tax on bank capital and bank checks; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Omaha, Nebr., and a petition of sundry citizens of Pender, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, firearms, and opium to the inhabitants of the New Hebrides and other islands; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SIMON presented the following joint memorial of the legislature of Oregon; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD:

Senate joint memorial No. 8.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the senate and the house of representatives of the State of Oregon, respectfully represent that there exist throughout the United States persons, firms, and corporations engaged in the business of manufacturing adulterated and unwholesome foods, whereby the lives of our inhabitants are greatly endangered, and the consumption of the same has become a serious menace to the public health; and

Whereas it has become a difficult matter for the public to distinguish from appearances between articles of food composed of inferior and unwholesome materials and those of wholesome and healthful ingredients; and

Whereas, by reason of the fraud and deceit practiced on the public by the manufacture of said adulterants, the honest producers of pure and wholesome foods are unable to compete with said manufacturers, and an unfair advantage is thereby taken of them, and many branches of industry in the State of Oregon and various other States, are seriously affected by reason thereof:

Now, therefore, in the interest of the public health and the welfare of our people, and for the protection of honest production and manufacture of healthful and wholesome articles of food, we ask that the Congress of the United States shall pass, without delay, such laws governing and regulating the production and sale of articles of food as will accomplish the end sought by this memorial.

STATE OF OREGON, County of Marion, ss:

I, S. L. Moorhead, chief clerk, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the original now on file in the office of the secretary of state.

S. L. MOORHEAD, Chief Clerk.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of Cooper Lodge, No. 114, International Association of Machinists, of Owosso, Mich., praying that all the remaining public lands be held for the benefit of the

whole people, and that no grants of title to any of these lands be made to any but actual settlers and home builders thereon; and also for the construction of storage reservoirs to save the flood waters of the country now being wasted, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. FOSTER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Alaska, praying that an appropriation be made for the completion of a military road from Valdez, Alaska, to Eagle City; and also for the completion of a telegraph line between those places and to intermediate points; and that the road may be used as an all-American route for carrying the United States mails, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of West End Lodge, No. 18, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Slater, Mo., praying that all the remaining public lands be held for the benefit of the whole people, and that no grants of title to any of these lands be made to any but actual settlers and home builders thereon; and also for the construction of storage reservoirs to save the flood waters of the country now being wasted, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., praying for the enlargement of the Government survey for a supply of artesian water for certain places along the Atlantic coast; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the public highways; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Savannah, Ga., praying for the adoption of certain plans for surveying, preserving, and improving the natural forests of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

Mr. HOAR presented a memorial of the Woman's Club of Worcester, the Woman's Educational Club of Newton, the New England Woman's Press Association, the Curret Topic Club of Dorchester, the Thought and Work Club of Salem, and the Woman's Club of Ayer, all in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the alleged recognition and regulation by the United States Government authority of vice in the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented the petition of Frederick B. Greul, D. D., and 89 other citizens of Waltham, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Bank Cashiers' Association of Massachusetts, praying for the repeal of the revenue-stamp tax on the capital and surplus of national banks and also upon bank checks; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Grange No. 53, Patrons of Husbandry, of Sterling; of Local Grange No. 155, Patrons of Husbandry, of Methuen, and of J. B. Richardson & Son and 36 other business firms of Lowell, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of General Joseph Hooker Command, No. 9, Department of Massachusetts, Union Veterans' Union of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing partial compensation for the survivors of prison-pen horrors; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Westport, Mass., extending thanks to the United States Senate for ratifying the treaty to protect natives in Africa against intoxicants, and for its action in excluding beer from the Army canteens; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Bedford, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of firearms, opium, and intoxicating liquors to the inhabitants of the New Hebrides and other islands; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the philanthropic committee of the Yearly Meeting of Friends of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a prompt cessation of the present war in the Philippine Islands and granting to the people of those islands the full measure of their rights; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Bridgton Highland Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Maine, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Association of the port of New York, praying for the completion of the breakwater at Point Judith, Rhode Island; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate divorces in the District of Columbia and the Territories; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the Indian Territory, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Delaware, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rockland, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the New Hebrides; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1223) for the relief of O. J. Markle, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 285) for the relief of the Mobile Marine Dock Company, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5085) to correct the military record of H. A. White, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3825) to grant an honorable discharge to Frederick A. Noeller, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 5417) to amend section 1754 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the preference in civil appointments of ex Army and Navy officers, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$132,590.67 to reimburse the city of Duluth, Minn., for moneys expended by it in the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on the harbor of that city, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5614) granting a pension to Virginia R. Friedeborn, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DILLINGHAM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5551) to waive and release all claims of the United States by way of escheat to the real estate in the District of Columbia of which Patrick Kavanagh or his sons, Charles W. Kavanagh and William Kavanagh, died seized, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 12491) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Metcalf;

A bill (H. R. 3466) granting a pension to Hiram Stimple;

A bill (H. R. 12710) granting an increase of pension to William H. Simmonds; and

A bill (H. R. 1235) granting an increase of pension to Chamness S. Burks.

Mr. VEST. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5911) amending an act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River to the city of St. Louis, in the State of Missouri, from some suitable point between the north line of St. Clair County, Ill., and the southwest line of said county," approved March 3, A. D. 1897, to report it adversely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Shall the bill be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. VEST. I ask that it be not acted upon, but let the report stand as it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will go to the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to inquire of the Senator if that is the bill which parties in another body have been considering, providing for a bridge between the two bridges that are there now?

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir; that is the bridge.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the bill will not be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. VEST. I asked the Chair not to enter the motion postponing it, but to let it go to the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go to the Calendar with the adverse report, at the request of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5925) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pittsburg and Mansfield Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River," reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5936) to authorize the Portland, Nehalem and Tillamook Railway Company to construct a bridge across Nehalem Bay and River, in the State of Oregon, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5935) to authorize the Montgomery and Autauga Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Alabama River near the city of Montgomery, Ala., reported it with amendments.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 11277) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Cord;

A bill (H. R. 7315) granting an increase of pension to William W. King; and

A bill (H. R. 11812) granting an increase of pension to Daniel E. Turner.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13237) granting a pension to Jacob Hoerr; and

A bill (H. R. 13236) granting an increase of pension to James Barton.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5038) granting a pension to David Pollock, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13133) granting a pension to Joseph V. Hoffecker; and

A bill (H. R. 9005) granting an increase of pension to William W. Schooley.

Mr. KENNEY (for Mr. ALLEN), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2692) granting an increase of pension to Louisa N. Godfrey, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5745) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Starratt, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FORAKER. On February 7 I reported from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico the bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900, and to increase the salary of the commissioner of education provided for by said act, with an amendment. I now beg leave to submit a report to accompany that bill, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be printed.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 11th instant, proposing to appropriate \$4,350, to pay to the county of Chester, Mont., in full settlement of all demands against the United States for the construction of a steel bridge across the Tongue River, etc., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 5833) to authorize the construction of reservoirs for the storage of water and for other hydraulic works for the reclamation of the public lands within the arid and semiarid land of the United States, and for other purposes, heretofore reported by him.

JENNIE E. HALLER AND OTHERS.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills:

A bill (S. 3644) for the relief of Jennie E. Haller, widow and administratrix of Samuel M. Haller, deceased;

A bill (S. 3966) for the relief of Smith Summers, administrator of John Waters, deceased;

A bill (S. 4978) for the relief of Richard Emmons and others;

A bill (S. 4999) for the relief of James A. Verret, administrator of Adolphe Verret, deceased;

A bill (S. 5098) for the relief of Mrs. Mattie H. Jarnagin; and

A bill (S. 5329) for the relief of William A. Gordon, administrator of the estate of William D. C. Murdock, deceased—reported the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the claims represented by the following bills, to wit, S. 3644, 3966, 4978, 4999, 5098, and 5329, for the relief of Jennie E. Haller, widow and administratrix of Samuel M. Haller, deceased; for the relief of Smith

Summers, administrator of John Waters, deceased; for the relief of Richard Emmons and others; for the relief of James A. Verret, administrator of Adolphe Verret, deceased; for the relief of Mrs. Mattie H. Jarnagin, and for the relief of William A. Gordon, administrator of the estate of William D. C. Murdock, deceased, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same are hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator what class of claims these are?

Mr. WARREN. They are those called Bowman Act claims, or Southern war claims—some that were not adjudicated by the Southern Claims Commission.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Is the decision of the court considered binding upon Congress; that is, does Congress always pay the judgments?

Mr. WARREN. No; not binding at all. They are sent down for findings alone and have to come back to Congress, and Congress can appropriate for payment or not as it sees fit. It is simply to take evidence and render to us a finding.

The resolution was agreed to.

BRANCH SOLDIERS' HOME IN IDAHO.

Mr. SHOUP. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by myself on the 12th instant, concerning the establishment of a Branch Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers on the Fort Sherman military reservation in Idaho, to report it favorably and to submit a written report thereon. I move that it, with the accompanying report, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After line 5 on page 110 insert:

The Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers shall cause to be inspected the buildings on the Fort Sherman Military Reservation, in Idaho, and the grounds contained therein, and make a report to Congress at its next session relative to the advisability of establishing a Branch Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at that place, and what additional buildings, if any, should be erected thereon for the use of such a Branch Home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment, with the accompanying report, will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I was going to ask that that reference be made.

I wish to take this occasion to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is constantly besieged with applications for more and more Soldiers' Homes. Although it is nearly forty years since the civil war, and we have great establishments of this kind in the large States, we are constantly asked to increase the number of Homes and to make it a local distribution; to put a Soldiers' Home in Illinois, and a Soldiers' Home in North Dakota, and in South Dakota, and now for Idaho, and Arizona will soon want a Soldiers' Home, and Wyoming will want a Soldiers' Home.

If we go on, Mr. President, and, as it would seem the needs of these Soldiers' Homes lessen, increase them, we have got to give some account, and we have got to make the country understand why it is that we are constantly increasing these Homes and increasing the military expenditures. It is a part of the military expenditures, an inheritance from the war; but the general belief is that as we get forty, fifty, and sixty years away from the great war we do not need any more of these Soldiers' Homes.

I simply take this opportunity to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is besieged constantly to add to these Homes.

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. President, I desire to say that it is contemplated by this amendment to establish a Branch Home at what has been known heretofore as Fort Sherman, in the State of Idaho. That post has been abandoned by the military authorities and has been turned over to the Interior Department. Montana, but more especially Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, feel that it should be set apart as a Branch Home.

This amendment carries no appropriation with it. It merely asks that the directors be authorized to investigate the matter, and I sincerely trust there will be no opposition to it. There is not a Branch of the National Soldiers' Home in all the Northwest. This covers a great many States, and in addition to the remaining veterans of the civil war there are a great many in those States who served in the recent war with Spain.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, it certainly is not a matter of surprise that more Soldiers' Homes are called for and that the military expenditure is on the increase. We are manufacturing material for Soldiers' Homes every day. We are preparing now to send an army of 100,000 men into the Tropics. General MacArthur in December reported that he had 10,000 sick in the hospitals of

Manila for which he had no medical attendance. The reports show that more soldiers than we have in the Philippines were admitted to the hospitals last year. Of course, a great many men were not in the hospitals, but many men were in several times; and the percent of those whose health is wrecked is unparalleled, so much so that the soldiers who come back from the Philippines have to be cared for. As long as we are recruiting the material by a conquest of tropical countries we shall have to continue to build Soldiers' Homes.

Unfortunately, from the remote West, or what used to be the remote West, from Idaho and the Dakotas and Wyoming, we sent more than our quota to the Spanish war. Those boys were taken to the Philippines and forced to fight in a contest in which they did not believe and which they believed to be wrong. Many of them died, and nearly all of the survivors came home diseased and unfit to labor and to earn a living. Of the boys who went from the State of South Dakota to the Philippines more than half have come home in a condition which renders it impossible for them to toil, and many have died since they returned. We are asking that a Soldiers' Home shall be built in South Dakota. There is a necessity for it, and it ought to be built. The Senate has ordered it built several times, and I hope that at this session it will order it again.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator before he sits down—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The debate is proceeding by unanimous consent. There is nothing before the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator before he sits down whether he does not think that the great Soldiers' Homes which were provided for and have been up to the present time as a place of refuge finally for an army of a million men as they grow old will be large enough to take care of the comparatively small contingent that comes from the East?

I agree with the Senator as to the condition that these men will be in. In five years from now every man who has gone to the East will be on the pension roll. There is no doubt about that, for this kind of a war is the most destructive, the most debilitating, and the most cruel in its ravages upon the human system of anything in the world, and we shall find them all on the pension list. But, even with that being so, it would seem to me as if the great institutions that we have already established in the country will be enough to take care of the relatively small portion of the hundred thousand men who will want to go to asylums. They will not all go there. They will want a pension, and we shall give it to them. They will be a disbanded and broken body of men, who will be upon the country in the country's care. There is no doubt about that. But there are not enough of them in number to justify this demand for more and more Soldiers' Homes.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, it seems to me there will be enough of them. We are recruiting the ranks of the people who will have to be taken care of, in my opinion, at the rate of at least 40,000 a year, and we will continue to do so for the years to come, because the contest in the Philippines will continue for years to come, in my opinion, unless we give those people their liberty.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to say only a few words. I believe that there is a necessity for National Soldiers' Homes in the Northwest. So far as Wyoming is concerned, it has established a State Home. It did not feel that it wished to enter into competition, asking for a National Home when Colorado in the one direction, Idaho in the other, and South Dakota in the other were asking for Homes. The old soldiers who went from the civil war to the West and who are unfortunate in their old age should be provided for somewhere in that part of the country and in the same general climate in which they have been living for many years.

I do not agree with the assertion that we are going to have many hundred thousand or a million men on the pension rolls or in the hospitals from the army in the Philippines. From my observation and information of Philippine matters and my experience in the civil war, we shall have a far less percentage in that army who will be asking for pensions and who will be inmates of Homes than as a result of the civil war. I am only surprised that we have so few of the old soldiers of the civil war now in Homes, when we remember that this is a time that they are all becoming old men, and even the youngest who served in that war are now old men.

Mr. TELLER. Colorado has a State Home.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator calls my attention to the fact that Colorado also has a State Home. It seems to me that by their works we should judge them, and that when Northwestern States establish, at their own expense, Soldiers' Homes, receiving some aid, as they do, from the Government, rather than to send their old soldiers to Eastern Homes, no matter how well they may be provided for or how many of them there are, it establishes the fact that in the opinion of those who live in those States it is necessary to have Homes there near where these failing old soldiers have spent so many years.

I have nothing to say in reference to the particular amendment

alluded to, but there should be one or two more National Homes provided in the Northwest. We can not overpay our old soldiers.

Mr. SEWELL. Mr. President, I desire to give the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] an opportunity to correct the statement which he has just made as to the application of the general commanding in the Philippines, stating that he had 10,000 sick and no surgeons. He said he did not have a sufficient surgical force, and as soon as the application was made for more they were immediately dispatched there.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am credibly informed that he complained he had 10,000 sick more than he had medical attendance for, and I believe it is correct.

Mr. SEWELL. That is not correct by any means.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And the Senator says it is not correct.

Mr. SEWELL. He wanted more surgeons and he got them immediately.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CHANDLER. I call for the regular order, and object to debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Reports of committees are in order.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to answer, in just one word, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SEWELL]. I have it upon what I regard as absolute authority that MacArthur telegraphed here that his medical staff was not sufficient and that he needed a staff for 10,000 more, not at Manila, perhaps, but in the whole archipelago. That has been given to me upon what I regard as entirely reliable authority. He wanted a staff to meet the demand, and I understand that he got them.

Mr. SEWELL. Immediately.

Mr. TELLER. Immediately.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And I have information on high—

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I call for the regular order, if the Senator from Colorado has concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Reports of committees are still in order. If there are none, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is next in order.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAFFERY introduced a bill (S. 5973) for the relief of the Citizens' Bank of Louisiana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 5974) granting an increase of pension to S. E. Chamberlain; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 5975) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Luke; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5976) granting an increase of pension to James A. McKeehan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5977) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sellers; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 5978) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appear in suits brought by States relative to school lands; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment proposing to pay John J. Sanborn \$3,200 for lot 3 in square south of square 990, in the city of Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$125,000 for the purchase of land necessary to provide a parkway connecting Rock Creek Park with Connecticut avenue between Klinge Ford road and Pierce Mill road, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted an amendment providing for the printing of 700 copies of the books of testimony, with all the reports, in the Montana Senatorial election case, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing for the printing of 1,600 copies of the proceedings in connection with the reception of the Webster statue on January 18, 1900, in the form prescribed by law for eulogies, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HOAR submitted an amendment providing that no individual or corporation having the privilege of access to the books in the offices of the clerks of the courts of the United States containing dockets, etc., shall use the same to collate material for the purpose of enabling them to render a substituted service of any character, etc., and that the clerks of the circuit and district courts of the United States be allowed 15 cents for every search for any particular mortgage, judgment, or other lien, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make settlement of claims growing out of Government transportation over nonbond-aided lines of the Southern Pacific Company and the Central Pacific Railroad Company by crediting against the notes of the Central Pacific Railroad Company held in the Treasury of the United States interest on all of said judgment and allowed claims at 4 per cent per annum, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13382) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. SPOONER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13382) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment authorizing the construction of reservoirs for the storage of water and for other necessary works for the reclamation of the public lands within the arid and semiarid regions of the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SEWELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12846) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 11 and 13.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment beginning with "Provided further," in line 10, page 1, of the amendments, and at the end of the bill add the following:

"SEC. 2. The Superintendent of the Military Academy shall suppress all challenge fighting and every form of hazing at the Academy, and shall, whenever advised of any facts tending to indicate any violation by a cadet or cadets of the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy or its rules, at once investigate the same in person or cause to be convened a court of inquiry to do so, as hereinafter provided.

"SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of every professor, assistant professor, academic officer or instructor, as well as every other officer stationed at the Academy, to promptly report to the Superintendent any fact which comes to his attention tending to indicate any violation by a cadet or cadets of the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy, or its rules.

"SEC. 4. Any cadet who shall act upon or be a member of any fighting or like committee, send, carry, or accept or order a challenge to fight, or be in any manner concerned or engaged in a fight preceded by a challenge, or order, or shall act as a referee, timekeeper, second, or sentinel thereat, or shall upbraid, abuse, or insult, or in any way maltreat any candidate or cadet because of his having refused to send or accept a challenge, or order to fight, shall, when found guilty, be dismissed.

"SEC. 5. Any cadet who shall direct, invite, or request any candidate or cadet to eat or drink anything for the purpose of punishing, annoying, or harassing him, or who shall, without lawful authority, direct or require any candidate or cadet to brace, or engage in any form of physical exercise, shall, when found guilty, be dismissed.

"SEC. 6. No cadet dismissed under either of the two preceding sections shall be in any way reinstated or reappointed to the Academy; and no such cadet shall ever be appointed to any office in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps.

"SEC. 7. All forms of hazing not herein expressly provided for shall be suppressed, under such regulations as shall now exist or may hereafter be lawfully established for the Academy.

"SEC. 8. Every cadet shall at all times be required to answer all questions pertaining to infractions of the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy or its rules, put to him by any court-martial, court of inquiry, or of any officer of the Academy, and upon his refusal so to do he shall be dismissed. But his evidence shall not be considered as against him in passing upon his guilt or innocence of any such infractions, nor shall it be used against him in any criminal proceeding or civil action for damages.

"SEC. 9. When the Superintendent knows or has reason to believe that any cadet is subject to the punishment prescribed in sections 4, 5, or 8 hereof, he is authorized to and shall at once convene a court-martial composed of not less than five commissioned officers to try such cadet. The finding of such court-martial, when approved by the Secretary of War, shall be final, and any cadet found guilty by it under any one of the said sections shall be dismissed, as in such section provided.

"SEC. 10. Whenever the Superintendent shall report to the Secretary of War that he has reason to believe that there have been infractions by one or more cadets of the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy, or its rules, and that he has been unable to ascertain the perpetrator or perpetrators thereof, or to obtain sufficient evidence to warrant action, the Secretary of War shall at once convene a court of inquiry to inquire into such supposed infractions, with directions, without unnecessary delay, to report the evidence taken by them and their findings and recommendations, all of which shall, when returned, be transmitted to the Superintendent, who shall thereupon enforce the laws, regulations, and rules as against all persons so reported to have violated them: *Provided*, That when evidence shall be adduced before such court of inquiry tending to show any infraction by a given cadet of the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy or its rules, said cadet shall be at once notified and shall be entitled to be at all times present while the inquiry is going on as against him, and to have witnesses called in his behalf, and to otherwise defend himself.

"SEC. 11. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of War to assign to the Academy a sufficient number of officers of the Army to at all times strictly enforce the laws of the United States, the regulations of the Academy and its rules, and to furnish such instruction and surveillance as may be necessary to insure that end; and he shall make such regulations as are necessary to produce such direct contact between the officers and cadets as will result in a thorough enforcement of this act.

"SEC. 12. Nothing in this act shall deprive the Superintendent of the authority to make internal rules for the government of the Academy not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or the regulations of the Academy."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and agree to the same with amendments as follows: On page 2 of the amendments, lines 17 and 18, strike out "allowance and emoluments," and on page 3, line 6, strike out "officers and;" and the Senate agree to the same.

WM. J. SEWELL,
F. E. WARREN,
W. A. HARRIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL,
CHAS. DICK,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The statement of the conferees is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 provides for the prevention of hazing at the Academy. House recedes and agrees with an amendment at end of bill having the same object.

Amendment No. 2 corrects the line rank of the Superintendent. House recedes.

Amendment No. 3 corrects an error in the amount of additional pay to commandant of cadets. House recedes.

Amendment No. 4 corrects an omission as to senior instructors. House recedes.

Amendment No. 5 relates to the legal status of the band as organized by the act of June 6, 1900. House recedes and agrees with amendments striking out the provisions for "allowances and emoluments" of, and "retirement" as, a second lieutenant to the teacher of music.

Amendment No. 6 corrects a clerical error. House recedes.

Amendment No. 7 corrects a clerical error. House recedes.

Amendment No. 8 is consequent on amendment No. 3. House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10 relate to extra pay for enlisted men. House recedes.

Amendment No. 11 relates to the pay of the master of the sword. Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 12 defines the duties, relative rank, etc., of the master of the sword. House recedes.

Amendment No. 13 consequent on amendment No. 11. Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 14 relates to fixtures for chemical lecture room. House recedes.

Amendment No. 15 makes the appropriation "immediately available." House recedes.

Amendment No. 16 consequent on amendment No. 14. House recedes.

Amendment No. 17 relates to the post cemetery. House recedes.

Amendment No. 18 provides for necessary officers' quarters. House recedes.

Amendment No. 19 provides for repairs of roads and paths. House recedes.

Amendment No. 20 makes an additional appropriation for "building for officers' quarters and mess" and provides that the same, also previous appropriation therefor, shall be available until expended. House recedes.

Amendment No. 21 is consequent on amendments Nos. 17, 18, 19 and 20. House recedes.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator desire the report acted upon to-day?

Mr. SEWELL. I see no reason why it should not be.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to see, if I can, the very complicated provision in regard to hazing, so that I may be able to understand it.

Mr. SEWELL. The amendment in regard to hazing embodies the views of the House investigating committee which took testimony at Westpoint. It goes into details and makes law what the Senate authorized the Secretary of War to do. On consideration the Senate conferees thought we had better have the provision in the shape of positive law than to leave it to another Secretary of War or another Superintendent of the Military Academy who might not be in sympathy with the feeling against hazing. This provision is stronger than that adopted by the Senate; and that is about all.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know how it can be much stronger. We provided by our amendment that a cadet found guilty of hazing should be dismissed, and should never thereafter be appointed or admitted to the Army or the Navy.

Mr. SEWELL. I know we did, but we did not go into all the details.

Mr. SPOONER. I am not discussing the question, and I can not discuss these provisions with the Senator, for I can not understand them without having an opportunity to examine them.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that portion of the report be again read as the conferees have agreed upon it.

Mr. CULLOM. That is what the Secretary has read.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read again, so that the Senate may understand what it is.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let us have order in the Chamber, Mr. President. We can not understand what is going on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will please be in order.

Mr. ALLISON. I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he allow the report to be printed and lie over until to-morrow, when it can be taken up, and I think much more intelligently considered than by having it read and reread at the desk.

Mr. SEWELL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. GALLINGER. That certainly ought to be done.

Mr. SEWELL. I have no objection. Let the report be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report of the conference committee will be printed.

Mr. SEWELL. And taken up to-morrow.

Mr. BURROWS. It will be printed in the RECORD, I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be printed as a document, as the Chair supposes.

Mr. CULLOM. The report has been read, and will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BURROWS. That is what I desire to know, whether it will be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be printed in the RECORD, it having been read.

MONTANA SENATORIAL ELECTION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the volumes of Report No. 1052 of the first session of the present Congress, now in the document room, with the testimony, concerning the Montana Senatorial election, be returned to the Public Printer, in order that part 2 of said report may be added at the end of page 24, and that the said part 2 be added in like manner by the Public Printer to the reserve volumes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE DISTRICT COMMITTEE.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the hearings before the Committee on the District of Columbia be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the said hearings be printed for the use of the Senate.

ACCOUNTS OF OFFICIALS IN ALASKA.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be directed to furnish the Senate with a copy of all accounts presented to his Department by officials of the Second judicial division of the district of Alaska during the present fiscal year and the action of the Department of Justice thereon; also, a list of all persons holding official positions during the last twelve months in said judicial division of the district of Alaska so far as the same is of record in the Department of Justice, together with the compensation of each of such persons.

PHILADELPHIA POST-OFFICE.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads be, and hereby is, directed to investigate the charges made by the National Civil Service Reform League that violations of the civil-service law have taken place in connection with the post-office at the city of Philadelphia; that said committee be authorized to sit during the present session or after the adjournment thereof, and to act, if the committee so decide, through a subcommittee, and said committee, or the subcommittee, shall have the right to send for persons and papers, swear and examine witnesses, employ a stenographer, and to hold its sittings either in Washington or Philadelphia, and the expenses of the inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee or of the subcommittee.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the foregoing resolution, reported it with amendments, and moved that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate; which was agreed to.

STATUS OF TENNESSEE ENROLLED MILITIA.

Mr. TURLEY. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to detail an agent to proceed to west Tennessee and take proof there as to the number of officers and enlisted men of the enrolled militia of

Memphis and the western district of Tennessee, organized into the service of the United States from 1863 to 1865, under the orders of Gen. W. T. Sherman and other United States military officers, the date of enlistment, the kind and duration of service, when discharged or disbanded, the amount, if any, paid to each officer and enlisted man, the amount of money that would be due to each officer and enlisted man if the same scale of pay and allowances then applicable to the United States Army was applied to the above-named organization, and the total amount of money required to pay such claims, and to report all the facts and evidence for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. TURLEY. In this connection I ask that the letter from the Secretary of War which was forwarded January 8, 1901, and laid on the table temporarily, may be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, together with the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the request of the Senator from Tennessee will be complied with. The Chair hears none, and the resolution and papers will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON LATE REPRESENTATIVE WISE.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to give notice that on Saturday the 23d instant, at such hour as may be most suitable, I shall offer appropriate resolutions touching the death of Hon. RICHARD ALSOP WISE, late a Representative from Virginia.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13801) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to the amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out, after the word "districts," line 6, page 33, the following:

To map the soils of the United States: *Provided*, That when 50 per cent of the arable soil of any State or Territory in which the work has been done shall have been mapped, no further work is to be done in that State or Territory till the same percentage of soil mapping shall have been accomplished in the other States and Territories of the United States: *Provided further*, however, That not less than one field season's work of one field force shall be done in any State or Territory before leaving that State or Territory.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I moved the amendment to strike out the portion of the bill on page 33 which has been read. I have said practically all I care to say about it. I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to the amendment, to have a vote upon it, and I shall then have discharged my duty.

I think the expenditure, while it will be small this year, will be very large next year, and the following years we must, if we enter upon this system, increase the appropriation to a very large amount in order that it may be of any benefit whatever.

We have no statement of what this work will cost or anything about it. It is a duplication, in part at least, of work being done by other Departments. Certainly we ought not to enter upon it, as suggested to me by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], until we are ready to adopt a system and then carry it out. I do not believe we are now prepared to say in an appropriation bill that the Government of the United States should map the whole country; and this proposition is certainly upon the supposition that the whole country is to be mapped, and the different soils described, to show whether they are useful for any particular kind of agriculture.

Maps are to be made, surveys are to be made, reports are to be made. The expense will be far beyond what anybody can now estimate and the benefit to be derived from this work is so shadowy and doubtful that it seems to me the chairman of the committee ought to accept the amendment, so as to get rid of this difficulty. I have made the motion to strike out the part which has been read, and I submit the matter to the Senate without further discussion.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I have a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture in regard to this matter, which I will ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1901.

DEAR SIR: Since colleges and universities were organized nobody has studied the soils from which we all get our living and in cultivating which half the American people are employed. The mapping of the soils of the several States will indicate to the people their adaptability to production. We shall get comparative conditions as between the soil of one State and the soil of another. We shall be able to indicate where certain crops can be best and most economically produced. We have entered, through cheap transportation, into competition with the whole world, and it becomes us to find facts for our producers that may enable them to meet this competition most economically. Soils of the several kinds are not bounded by State lines. A work of this kind done by the Department of Agriculture will be of great general interest.

We are now mapping where the interests of the people imperatively demand it. The alkali soils of the West and the tobacco soils of the several States where tobacco is grown are getting attention. We are mapping the truck soils of the Atlantic coast, and we shall inquire into the fruit areas of the country, the rice soils of the Gulf States, the sugar soils for cane sugar in the South, and the soils for sugar beets along our northern tier of States.

Respectfully,

JAMES WILSON, *Secretary.*

HON. REDFIELD PROCTOR,
*Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
United States Senate.*

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has received a large number of applications for special examinations in localities where they need information whether the soil is adapted to particular crops. These applications are from California, Utah, Connecticut, North Carolina, Mississippi, Maryland, Iowa, Kentucky, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Louisiana, Virginia, Montana, Arizona, Washington, Colorado, Wyoming, South Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, and Texas. I have copies of some of the letters and a brief statement of what is asked for; but what I have said sufficiently covers the ground, which is to have an expert inquiry made in regard to the soils of special localities.

I myself think the appropriation is a desirable one and that it will not be abused. The Secretary of Agriculture has, so far as I have had to do with this work, been extremely conservative and practical.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. Let the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado be again stated, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. I have moved to strike out a portion of the amendment of the committee.

Mr. HOAR. I ask that it may be stated from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The Secretary again read the amendment proposed by Mr. TELLER to the amendment of the committee on page 33, beginning in line 6.

Mr. TELLER. The letters which the Senator from Vermont says have been received, indicate just what I said would be the demand from every part of the country for this work. If we are going into it, we ought to go into it with our eyes open; we ought to know what it is going to cost; we ought to know whether the advantages will be equal to the expenditure; and we now know absolutely nothing about it.

To a limited extent the Agricultural Department has always examined soils and made reports to the people who desire to have that done. But this is a proposition to map and survey the whole country in order to find out whether in New England people can raise wheat, or whether in Colorado they can raise alfalfa and other things.

I do not care to say anything further. Of course, it is not any more to me than it is to anybody else; but it does seem to me that to commence an enterprise of this kind, with our lack of information as to its extent and character, is simply absurd.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is too large a proposition to be disposed of on an appropriation bill without very careful consideration. I should like to have a report from the Department of Agriculture as to the expense which will be incurred. The remapping of the United States is an enormous undertaking. We have had some experience of that with the Geological Survey. We have progressed so far with that work that we must carry it through. It will be of great advantage. But those who have examined or are familiar with the work of mapping and printing maps will realize the very great extent of this work. The Secretary of Agriculture is a man of practical experience. If he will give us the plan, show its desirability, and that the work can be done at a reasonable cost, I shall be in favor of it; but I should not be in favor of it with my present information.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, has the point of order been made on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. HALE. Then I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the point of order; that it is in violation of Rule XVI, being new legislation?

Mr. HALE. It is entirely new legislation; there is no law for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will be pleased to hear from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], the chairman of the committee, on the point of order.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the present law provides for the mapping of tobacco soils all over the country. This is merely an extension of that law, as it strikes me.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator let me look at the law?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator will find it on page 8. That is limited, while this is general.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, my point of order is that this amendment proposes a new system of general legislation for embarking upon an entire system of making comparisons of soils all

over the United States. There is no law for that to-day, any more than there is a law for the Government itself entering into the building of ships in private yards. It needs a law to authorize it. The senior Senator from Vermont said the present law authorized it. The present law simply provides a little appropriation for some experimentation upon soils, and it is only for a year's appropriation. If anybody last year had made the point of order against that little appropriation it would have been sustained, because it was new matter. This declares how it shall be done; fact establishes a system of law. There is to-day no law for it. The fact that last year a little appropriation was consented to and no point of order made does not in any way free this from the point of order.

And besides the point of order, as the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nevada have said, we ought not upon an appropriation bill, crowded through at the last days of the session, to enter upon a scheme which will cost this country a hundred million dollars. Is there to be no stop, Mr. President, to all these new schemes for depleting the Treasury? This scheme, I say, in the end will cost a hundred million dollars. It will never be ended until every State and every county are visited by a corps of Government officers and all these comparisons made and all these soils developed and reports made; and from year to year it will increase. It increased last year from about how many thousand dollars?

Mr. PROCTOR. Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. HALE. Up to \$91,000 this year?

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes.

Mr. HALE. It has increased 300 per cent. It will go on in this way. It requires a law to do it, and in the interest of some moderation in these new schemes and because I have no doubt that the point of order is good I make it against this appropriation.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I told the Senator from New Hampshire yesterday afternoon that there was no danger but that somebody would take hold of this proposition to be just a little less stingy with the agricultural interests of this country, and that it was impossible that we should get anything like liberal appropriations for the practical and reasonable expenditures; and, lo and behold, this morning the point of order is made against the work of the Committee on Agriculture and the Commissioner of Agriculture, whom everybody acknowledges is an able man and one as well qualified to discharge the duties of his position as ever filled that place. It does seem to me that the Chair might in this instance, supposing it is ready to rule with the Senator from Maine, submit this question to the judgment of the Senate, and let Senators themselves decide whether or not it is amenable to the point of order. I have seen that thing done here too often—for us to have a rule that is hidebound and not allow a little leeway for Senators to determine whether an appropriation is reasonable and proper.

The Senator from Maine was not in the Chamber yesterday afternoon when this paragraph was discussed, or he would have seen that this survey and this mapping do not contemplate entering upon a topographical measurement of a State. It does not contemplate entering into competition with the Geological and Geodetic Surveys.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, I have said nothing about topography. Of course it does not.

Mr. TILLMAN. Where is the hundred millions to come from which the Senator from Maine says is to go into this rat hole unless we are going to go into a new survey of that which has been already done?

Mr. HALE. It is a vaster subject than topography. I notice this here:

To investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

It is not confined to the United States.

Mr. TILLMAN. Cuba is not a competing country. The Senator from Maine himself is very much of the opinion that we never intend to let Cuba go; that it is going to be a part and parcel of the great domain of this country.

Mr. HALE. I hope not.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope not, too, and I will help the Senator so far as I am able in my feeble way to prevent any such consummation. The Senator from Maine, who is not a farmer—

Mr. HALE. Oh, yes, I am.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator lives in town and spends on his farm the money he receives from other sources of income.

Mr. HALE. I have always been a farmer.

Mr. TILLMAN. The point I wish to make in regard to this general provision is that while it covers a great deal of apparent territory, it is in order to get around the Auditor of the Treasury, who will have to pass upon the expenditures. Senators should recollect that only \$109,000 all told is proposed to be appropriated to give the farmers of this country or those intending to migrate from various portions to other portions some idea, officially, as to where they can enter upon their chosen occupation of fruit growing or tobacco raising or any other branch of the agricultural industry, that they may have the benefit of the Agricultural Department's report that such and such a section of such and such a

State is adapted to this, that, or the other product. What is contemplated, I understand, is simply that an expert, who is acquainted with the geology of a given territory, or who will acquaint himself with it, shall take the outline map of a State and after investigation and travel, involving a few thousand dollars of expenditure in a given State, he will submit a map colored to indicate, like the physical geographies indicate, only more in detail and backed by expert testimony, where given fruits or given grains or given agricultural products of various kinds succeed best.

I confess I do not understand why the Senator from Maine, who is usually so liberal and broad minded, should be so niggardly in dealing with agriculture. We spend hundreds of millions here that are stolen, and the Senator knows it, and yet when we come to give a farmer, a Republican farmer, a few paltry thousands to help develop farming, the basis of our national prosperity, here comes a great hue and cry for economy, economy, economy.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the bill how much this item involves?

Mr. PROCTOR. It involves \$91,000. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to say a word?

Mr. PETTUS. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator from Maine says it involves a great future expense, a hundred million dollars. At the rate of this appropriation it would require something over eleven hundred years to use the amount of which he speaks.

Mr. HALE. If the increase from last year to this is maintained, it will not take so long.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, we have here before us two pictures. One is an urged proposition to spend \$225,000,000 for the benefit of a very small class, counting the whole people, of ship-owners and shipbuilders. That is urged as of great benefit to all mankind. That is one of the pictures. On the other hand, we have a proposition to spend less than a hundred thousand dollars for the benefit of more than half of the population of the United States; and the Secretary of Agriculture, this wise man who is attending to his business and not to mere politics, writes in the very first words of his communication that he has sent to the Senate the following:

Since colleges and universities were organized nobody has studied the soils, from which we get our living and in cultivating which half the American people are employed.

There is the other picture, and the Senators seek, by any technicality that can be invented, to prevent this wise man from doing what he wants to do for the benefit of agriculture. Look on the two pictures!

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I wish to show what the provision means. It was not drawn by any farmer. The farmers of this country are not uneasy and disturbed because they are not visited by boards of United States surveyors and managers to try their soils and compare them with other soils and to send out expeditions into every country and every isle of the globe. The farmers of the country do not want that. I speak as much for the farmers—I know all about farming—as does the Senator from South Carolina or any other farmer here. His constituents do not demand this, nor mine, nor those of any other Senator.

This plan was drawn by some ingenious man in the Department—not the Secretary, probably—who sees before his eyes the vista of a great, expanding, national, new source of expenditure. Let me read it:

Investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life.

Nobody can draw a phrase involving an enterprise that is limitless and endless and put it in stronger language than that. There is no end to it.

For the investigation of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory.

In doors and out of doors, everything under the heavens is included in that.

For the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts.

I judge from what the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Colorado said, who represent the farmers and the owners of land in irrigated districts, that their constituents do not want that.

The investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage water.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. That is all the law now.

Mr. HALE. It is not the law. We only appropriated a little sum of money, and this year it is sought to increase it three or four hundred per cent. There is no law for it. We have made little experiments. What I am complaining of is just what happens always. You start with a few thousand dollars; then you increase it, and at last it becomes so great that you have an enormous new field of national expenditure launched. The same pro-

portion of increase from last year to this kept up for ten years will amount to over a hundred million dollars. I have had it figured out by accountants since it was first brought up here. It would amount to more than a hundred million dollars. Let me read a little further about this farmer clause:

The investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters, and of methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters in irrigated districts.

And then, finally—

To map the soils of the United States.

No man sitting in this Chamber will be here or alive on this footstool when that map of the soils of the United States is completed. There is nothing so limitless and so endless as a map. We have tried it with topography. We have tried it with geodetic surveys and coast surveys. It never ends, and when one locality has it another wants it, and will insist upon it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is there any man on the footstool now who saw the origin of the Coast and Geodetic Survey? Why should we undertake to prevent Time from getting in his work.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator is arguing in my line. All of these things began in a small way.

Mr. TILLMAN. We will pay taxes or our children will pay taxes forever, and why not allow the taxes to be spent for the benefit of coming generations.

Mr. HALE. I remember when the Geological Survey first commenced. My friend the Senator from Illinois remembers it. Authority was given to make a map. It is going on; it is accumulating force every year until every district shall be mapped.

Now, what I say—I have not got through with these provisions—is that the Government never ought to go into this. The farmers do not demand it. They know the soils. They know the adaptability of their acres to a particular growth. They are practical, hard-headed men, and they take no stock in this fanciful scheme that has been drawn up by some expert in the Agricultural Department to commit the Government. I have not quite got through with this ingenious provision:

That not less than one field season's work of one field force shall be done in any State or Territory before leaving that State or Territory.

Not less in the forty-five States than one field party shall be engaged in the State before it leaves it. It does not say not more, but it plants them in each one of the States, and the day begins to which there will be no end. Now let us see.

To investigate the soils and conditions of growth—

The imagination of the man who drew this scheme grew as he went on forging this scheme. He had got the whole country included in it. He had got everything under the sun that could be done within our borders, and his imagination taking flight, he said, "Why should not all the kingdoms of the earth and the isles of the sea and the entire habitable globe be brought into this new enterprise?" and so he says:

To investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra—

And then, rather than go on and name everybody and everything and every country, he says—

And other competing countries.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HALE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have in my hand the last appropriation act, containing this item, to which the Senator did not object, as I recollect it, and I will read it:

To map the tobacco soils of the United States; to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I will call his attention to the fact that in my State tobacco culture has become recently very profitable, and it came into that State, as I said yesterday in the Senator's absence, by reason of the fact that notwithstanding we had hard-headed, sensible men there who, to quote the Senator, "knew what their soils would produce," they never knew, until a Virginian who was acquainted with the culture of tobacco came along, that we could grow the finest bright tobacco; and we are now competing with Sumatra and Cuba, and we want the technical information as to how better to compete.

Mr. HALE. I do not want the Senator to make a speech, even if it is a good speech, in my speech. If he has any question to ask I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am only quoting to the Senator the law as it is now, upon which he is animadverting.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is repeating it over and over again. That law, as it has been called, has been brought to my attention three or four times here. It is no law. It is simply a provision

for a moderate amount of money for certain purposes, so limited in its amount that it was not dangerous.

Mr. TILLMAN. But the Senator—

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I can not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine declines to yield.

Mr. HALE. I ought to have objected last year, but it was a little baby. It did not attract my attention enough. I ought to have seen what would come, that this year it would be three or four times as large, and would mean the organization of this new band of Government officials seeking to go all over the earth and report upon its condition. This year it has leaped right up nearly 400 per cent, and, as I said, if it goes on at the same rate, in less than ten years it will take more than a hundred million dollars.

I do not know that it is any use to object. It seems to me sometimes as if nothing is so thankless in the present condition of things, when every interest and every scheme is organized to loot the Treasury, as to object. The general demoralization that has seized upon the public mind, upon Congress, the tremendous expenditures that stand before our eyes every day, have demoralized the human mind. We are incapable, Mr. President, of reading and understanding and appreciating figures in the presence of the tremendous expenditures which some day will come back; and when the people realize it, those who are responsible for them will call on the rocks and mountains to hide them from the uprising of the people against this extravagance. It is too early yet, evidently. Every measure is urged because it has some great interest or industry or class behind it, and when we get to the end of this Congress and figure up the appropriations the sums will be larger, very considerably larger, than any estimate that has been made here on the floor of the Senate by any authority upon these subjects. It is in just such times as these that these things come in. I should not have been attracted to it if I had not looked over it and seen how it leaped up from last year to this year, and this year I realize that I ought to have made the point last year or year before. Now I know and I see, and Senators now see.

The amendment is clearly subject to the point of order. It is a great system of general legislation. I do not know whether the Chair, upon the intimation which has been given, will decline to rule upon the point of order, but undoubtedly as a parliamentarian, I know how he ought to feel about it. He may submit it to the Senate, and Senators may vote this in; but I give them fair warning that they are then only starting on this road, and that when it goes through you will have next year four or five or six times as large an appropriation asked for, and it will go on from year to year.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, as I understand it, this provision was inserted in the bill largely upon the suggestion of the farmers of this country, who have communicated with the Secretary of Agriculture on the subject.

The Senator from Maine states that it is not desired by the farmers. I submit that the Senator from Maine, who made the startling statement here this morning that he is a farmer, knows but very little about the farming interests of the United States. He may be what is termed an agriculturist, but I do not admit that he is a farmer. There is a wide difference between an agriculturist and a farmer. Horace Greeley, I believe, was an agriculturist, and his cabbages cost him a dollar a pound. But he was not a farmer. Experience proved that to be a fact. So I submit the Senator from Maine is not much of a farmer and knows but very little about what the farmers in this country want.

Mr. FRYE. Which Senator from Maine?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. The Senator from Maine who usually sits directly in front of me. I do not mean the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. President, I do not share in the alarm which has been given here by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as to the enormous extravagance of this appropriation. I do not believe it is going to run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, as he claims it will, or anywhere near it.

I know something about the examination of the soils in my own State. Of course, farming in Maine and farming in North Dakota are two different propositions. There we sow wheat and other grain with the improved modern drills, but on the hillsides of Maine they are obliged to plant their corn, I am told, by shooting the seed into the ground under the rocks with a rifle. There is a great difference between planting in Maine and planting in North Dakota or elsewhere in the great agricultural regions of the country.

In the State of North Dakota the examination of soils has been made for the past few years with a great degree of success, and I have every reason to believe that the work is almost completed at the present time. It does not require much work to ascertain the qualities of the soil of a farming State, and all the States in the West are farming States and are interested in this provision. It is not an expensive business, this examination of soils. I venture to say that most of the work of the examination of soils in my

State is finished to-day, and that the Secretary of Agriculture knows, practically as far as he desires to know, the qualities of that soil. It may be true that he now desires to make a chemical analysis in order to improve the grade of wheat, or flax, or oats, or barley, or other grains which we raise in great abundance in that State, and I agree that that ought to be done.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Maine that this is going to run into a great sum of money. The Senator from Maine has recently acquired the habit of materializing the ghost of extravagance on the floor of the Senate. I am not predisposed to vote the Government's money away recklessly, but in cases of this kind, where an appropriation like this goes directly to the basis of our institutions, so to speak—agriculture—I think the Senate ought not to be niggardly in the matter.

I hope this provision will remain in the bill, that it will be kept there by the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much these sudden rushes toward economy. It is certainly refreshing to know that we speak on the side of economy once in a while. In the two sessions, however, of this Congress it has been observed by me at least that every time we ask for an appropriation toward the amelioration of the conditions of the farming communities of this country the cry of useless extravagance is always raised. I noted that at the beginning of the first session of this Congress. A bill passed this body providing for the expenditure of \$30,000 or \$60,000 for a commission to visit Japan and China to investigate conditions there and to ascertain whether we could introduce our wheat and our flour products into those countries. As soon as it got to the House it was found to be excessive and extravagant and nothing could be obtained in that line.

Mr. President, I want to say here that the greatest benefit which has been obtained in my State from any character of legislation has been obtained through the Agricultural Department. The great expanse of the Red River Valley was but a few years ago dedicated only to the raising of wheat. It is now quite certain that it can be utilized for other purposes. A few years ago, on account of our long winters and the small amount of grass in the valley, it was presumed that we could not possibly compete with the balance of the country in stock raising. Lately, by testing a number of grasses that have been recommended by the Agricultural Department, and having in view the character of the soil in which those grasses can be grown, it has been found that we can raise stock quite successfully now, even in the valley which a few years ago was supposed to be adapted only to wheat culture.

Mr. President, we know that we get benefits in this way, and I can not see how any Senator can refuse to grant this little appropriation to determine what sections of our State and what sections of other States in the United States are adapted particularly to different characters of cereals.

There is another thing I desire to say here. It seems to me that our economy runs into extravagance in some cases. We can not afford to expend \$100,000 or a few hundred thousand dollars, or what Senators say will amount to a million in a few years, for the purpose of directly informing the farming community what cereals they can successfully raise in their particular sections or what character of roots can be successfully raised there, and yet, at the same time, we can vote, as we did at the beginning of this session, \$5,000,000 for an exposition down in one of the Southern States, where we can build out of cement beautiful structures showing a great deal of advancement in architectural designs, and in which we can display a great many of our agricultural products, not the usual character of agricultural products in any section, not the medium of what may be obtained from any section, but the very best that may be obtained by excellent care at an enormous cost. We can spend that money so that people may go and look at those articles and get an exaggerated idea of the places where they can be raised, and yet at the same time we can not afford \$100,000 to be expended in determining what sections can raise the articles which the people, at an expense of five or ten million dollars, have been invited to look at.

Mr. President, it seems to me that as little as has been done, and possibly as little as can be done, in this country for the direct benefit of the agriculturists, who can not be protected by any character of tariff, they being all exporters, we certainly ought to grant them enough consideration to give them the benefit of an expenditure to determine what portions of their country are adapted to the raising of the many products; and this can only be determined successfully and properly, not by a few experiments, which may cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, but by experiments made through the channels of the Agricultural Department which may result beneficially to the people.

Mr. President, we are reminded here that we are demoralizing the country by these excessive contributions. I want to say that if even a small portion of the sums of money which we are constantly called upon to appropriate for higher and higher salaries

of individuals were utilized for the benefit of those people who may be required to pay the salaries, it seems to me there would be ground for economy in that line. The Northwestern sections, the wheat-growing sections of the country, and especially those sections which it has been supposed were adapted to only one or two or three kinds of cereals are demanding, and justly demanding, the relief that is sought in this bill, and I certainly hope that it will be accorded.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, since the point of order was made by the Senator from Maine the debate has been wholly upon the merits of the proposition. I supposed the Chair, before making the decision, would not be unwilling to hear a little debate on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites debate upon that point.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now, Mr. President, with reference to the point of order, it seems to me that it is not well taken by the Senator from Maine. If there had been nothing in the House bill, I suggest to the Chair, on this subject of soil investigation, concerning a division of soils or a bureau of soils, it might perhaps be well decided by the Chair that this long amendment would not be in order. I call attention to the fact that this clause, upon which the Senator from Maine makes a point of order, is a substitute for lengthy provisions of the House bill. In the House bill, on page 30, is a heading: "Division of Soils, salaries," and provision is made for the personnel of that division. Then follow on two pages and a half the appropriations for soil investigation.

The Committee on Agriculture have retained all of these provisions in reference to soil investigation, and have added other provisions, and clearly it is within the province of the Senate to do that thing. There is no rule of order prevailing in the Senate which by any possibility prevents the Senate from varying, from subtracting from and adding to the House provision. We can not get rid of the House provision upon a point of order in the Senate. We must accept it, or reject it, or amend it.

The Senator from Maine, therefore, I think is clearly wrong in reference to his point of order; probably because he overlooked the fact that the amendment to which he objected is an amplification of the House provision.

And, Mr. President, here I wish to say that I do not think the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should have amended the bill in this way. I think a vicious system is growing up in the Senate of striking out provisions of a House bill which are in fact retained, but enlarged or changed. The committee, I respectfully submit, should have retained the House provisions and should have made the necessary changes, and then nobody would have thought of making this point of order.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me a moment?

Mr. CHANDLER. All these provisions on pages 30 and 31 which are stricken out are retained in the amendment of the Committee on Agriculture. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROCTOR. The purpose of striking it out was because of the change of the organization from a division to a bureau. That made necessary so much change that it was thought better to change the form and insert a new provision in lieu of that adopted by the House.

Mr. CHANDLER. It was thought better. That undoubtedly was the judgment of the committee. So when the Committee on Finance was called upon to deal with a House taxation bill, instead of amending the text of it they struck it all out, and we sent back to the House a wholly new bill, and debate takes place as to whether the Senate has or has not exceeded its powers under the Constitution. Whilst I do not think the Senate did exceed its powers under the Constitution, which allows the Senate to propose amendments to revenue bills, yet I think, and take occasion to say, that a system under which the whole of the House bill is stricken out and a new Senate bill is substituted, and then the bill with the substitute is sent to a conference committee, is a system which ought to be restricted and condemned instead of being enlarged and practiced upon.

But, Mr. President, the amendment in this case is, as I submit, although mistakenly made in form, an amendment that is clearly admissible according to the rules of the Senate.

Now, one word, Mr. President, about the merits of the amendment. I think the Senator from Maine does a public service whenever he calls the attention of the Senate to the tendency of Congress to extravagance. On this side of the Chamber we ought to realize very well that notwithstanding we may get help from Senators on the other side of the Chamber in enlarging specific appropriations, yet when the sum total of the appropriations of this Congress is made up and an issue is made with the people concerning the extravagance of the Fifty-sixth Congress, those very Senators will denounce the Republican party for its extravagance, and they will not take occasion to say, "We helped a little about it ourselves."

No Senator upon the stump will say, "These enormous appro-

priations were extravagant; I was against a great many of them, most of them, but I did get my little bill through." When the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], who is a frank and a candid man, raves upon the political stump two years from now about the extravagances of the Fifty-sixth and Fifty-seventh Congresses, he will not give the Republican party any credit for the few little things done for him at his request and with his help.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator gets up to ask questions continually, and he is yielded to in order that he may ask them; but he never asks a question; he always interjects a speech into somebody else's speech.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will ask a question this time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will it be a question? I will yield if it be a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire yields for a question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to ask the Senator if his State were paying taxes—as it is, I suppose—and yet when the distribution of those taxes showed clearly that for \$1 paid into the Treasury they got back about a dime, would he not be willing to get almost any kind of an appropriation for his State, even though it was a little tainted sometimes with lack of public utility, when he saw so many millions going for dishonest ship subsidies and the like?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, Mr. President; I would be willing to get for my section an appropriation for anything that was needed. We all know the principle of the Senator from South Carolina. He has announced it over and over again in this Chamber in connection with tariff bills: "Tariff legislation is robbery; but if the robbery is to take place, I want South Carolina to have its share of the robbery."

Now, Mr. President, I would not state that I would be willing to do that, no matter where the moneys are collected and no matter how they are expended. I do not think I would ask for New England an appropriation of Congress for any object if I did not think it was useful to make that appropriation. I do not say that the Senator from South Carolina or any other Senator on the other side of the Chamber asks for appropriations for his section which he does not think are really needed.

What I called attention to was the fact that after all, when the appropriations of this Congress and of the first session of the next Congress are made up, and there is a political campaign to determine what shall be the complexion of the next House of Representatives, the Republican party, which is the party in power in the country, will be overwhelmed with assaults because of its extravagant appropriations of the public money; and therefore I think the Senator from Maine and Senators on this side of the Chamber do well when they utter a word of caution in connection with any appropriation which is made.

Mr. President, while I shall vote for this amendment, and am willing to give the sum specified here, \$91,000, for all of these objects, yet I respectfully call the attention of the Committee on Agriculture, and to the farmer on the other side of the Chamber, and any other farmer on the other side of the Chamber, to the fact that \$91,000 is an insignificant appropriation with which to do all of these things. The Senator from Maine has recited them. Senators have the propositions before them as to what this Division of Soils is to do. Ninety-one thousand dollars will not begin to scratch the surface of their duties. They will not undertake to cover the whole ground of that provision during the next year. They will spend the \$91,000. Undoubtedly they will investigate the part of it in connection with tobacco. My friend from South Carolina will not give the Department of Agriculture any peace unless it does spend some portion of that \$91,000 for the objects he thinks ought to be investigated first.

But, Mr. President, not one-tenth of the ground which it is proposed to cover by this amendment will be covered by the \$91,000, and what will the result be? The Secretary will tell us next winter that he has not been able to cover this ground, which Congress has directed he shall cover, and he will ask for a larger appropriation. So, as the Senator from Maine says, \$100,000 will go up to \$200,000. We shall be fortunate if there is not a deficiency. If the Secretary undertakes to cover this ground, it will be a hundred thousand dollars next year, and \$300,000 the next year, and so on until it is quite likely this Bureau will grow up to be an extravagance.

Now, Mr. President, if we are going to be extravagant I am willing to see the country extravagant in connection with agriculture. If we are going to be extravagant in the money that we are going to pay the railroads for the transportation of the mails, I am willing to vote for the proposition to expedite the Southern mail service; but I think a few more arguments in favor of economy, as to whether it would be as well placed in connection with agriculture as in connection with some other subjects, will not do the Senate any harm.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I do not agree with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] in the contention that his point of order is well taken. This is a general appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. Now, in the rule which is, I presume, invoked to sustain the point of order, we find these words on page 16 of the Manual:

And no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be to carry out the provisions of some existing law.

That is as far as it is necessary to read for the purpose of testing the particular amendment as to whether or not it is in accordance with the rule.

I repeat, this is a general appropriation bill for the use of the Agricultural Department, and the simple question is, this being an amendment, whether or not it carries out the provisions of an existing law. That is the simple test.

Now, what are the purposes for which the Agricultural Department is organized? Of course an appropriation to carry out the purposes for which it is organized as that purpose is declared by the law is a legitimate appropriation. In the organization of the Agricultural Department, which is found in section 520 of the Revised Statutes, we have these words; the very first section of the law passed in 1862 organizing the Agricultural Department is as follows:

SEC. 520. There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

The last phrase in that section calls to mind a suggestion which may be used in illustration of the argument. Every appropriation which is made for the purchase of seeds is made by virtue of the fact that there is a general provision of law which authorizes the Department to procure seeds. It is upon that ground that no point of order could be made against any amendment to an appropriation bill making an appropriation for the purchase of seeds.

The simple question is whether the investigation of soils and the mapping of soils is any such information as that which is contemplated by this section of the law.

The general design and duties of which—

Speaking of the Department of Agriculture—

The general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

Can there be any general and useful information more important than the question as to what particular soils may be fitted for in the work of agriculture? Where are you to draw the line, Mr. President? Of course there might be provisions put into an appropriation bill which it might be claimed fall within the limitations of this description. They might fall in the classification of useful information on a subject connected with agriculture, and yet there might be some such thing alleged to be within that class which would be so ultra as to call forth a ruling by the Chair that it does not fall within the classification. But wherever there is any subject which falls legitimately within the classification of useful information on subjects connected with agriculture it certainly does not fall within the prohibition of the rule when an appropriation is made for the purpose of carrying it out.

I can not conceive of anything where the information would be more useful and would be more certainly recognized as useful information connected with the subject of agriculture than information as to what particular products are to be considered as within the legitimate labor of a farmer on certain soils and what others he need not attempt because they would not be productive. I do not think, Mr. President, it is necessary to elaborate that. It may be that I am wrong in my conclusion, but it seems to me to be so plain that this particular appropriation falls distinctly within the limits of the general law now existing as not really to be improved by elaboration or argument.

As the debate has extended a little beyond the point of order, and we are to consider the general question, I will say that I do not share with the Senator from Maine the apprehension as to the vast expenditure which this will lead to.

I do not understand, Mr. President, as has been suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, that it is contemplated that there shall be a detailed topographical or physical examination of the soil in every county in the United States. I understand that as to some classes of products the information is already, within certain limits, in the possession of anyone who will be apt to be chosen to the position of Secretary of Agriculture. For instance, when a map comes to be made on the subject of cotton, while it would not be considered necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to go to South Carolina or to Georgia for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not cotton can be successfully raised in those States, or to Texas or Alabama or Mississippi, there will be

a certain color just for the purpose of illustration to be used on that map to indicate the cotton country; there will not be a question asked about South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, or Arkansas, but that color would be put upon the map without any investigation, because there are certain sections of the country where it is known beyond doubt that cotton can be successfully raised. But there are some sections of the country where that map, in the portrayal of something to the eye which would indicate the character of the soil with reference to production, would have to be shaded off.

A man in the Northwest, for instance, may desire to go to a cotton-raising country. Cotton is raised in some parts of Tennessee, but not in other parts of Tennessee. In some parts of North Carolina cotton is grown successfully, but in other parts of North Carolina conditions have gradually changed until in those parts of North Carolina it is not grown productively.

Take the subject of the sugar beet, which is a very important one, and one which I think possibly in the future will be very much more important than is now realized. There are some sections of the country where it is known that the sugar beet grows with success. There are numbers of States within certain areas where the investigation will not have to be made; but as in the case of cotton, so in the case of the sugar beet, the territory in which the sugar beet can be productively raised gradually shades off to where it can not be productively raised. For instance, in my State very serious inquiry was made as to whether or not the sugar beet could be successfully grown there.

Other kinds of beets are grown there for edible purposes very successfully; and a great many people have been of the opinion that the sugar beet could be successfully grown there. But investigation has led to the conclusion—not entirely fixed, but one which would be very much more certainly ascertained by the Agricultural Department—that conditions do not favor the growth of the sugar beet in that section of the country; and yet there is a very large intervening section between Georgia, where it can not be successfully grown, and Nebraska, if you please, where it can be, which is debatable and doubtful ground.

It is the same as to fruits. Nobody wants to know or to be told that the peach industry or the watermelon industry can be successfully undertaken in Georgia; they do not want to be told that it can be successfully undertaken in Delaware or Maryland; but they do want to be told that there are different varieties adapted to different sections, and thereby very much is saved, not only to the farmer in making useless experiments, but very much is added to his profit by his being able to direct his industry intelligently. I might go further with the illustration as to fruits, vegetables, cereals, and farm products of all kinds.

I do not apprehend that there is going to be the immense expenditure which has been stated—certainly not in this bill; and if the time comes when it shall be shown that there is this immense expenditure, the question will be whether it is a profitable expenditure. If it is shown to be a profitable expenditure, I do not see why Congress should hesitate in making the expenditure for these particular purposes when it does not halt at others which involve a very much larger amount.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BACON. I yield for a question.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was just going to remind the Senator as to the mapping of which he speaks, and which he is advocating, in regard to the culture in Georgia, for instance, of peaches that there are certain sections of Georgia and South Carolina where peach growing is very profitable, and where it is already being very largely carried on; but there are other sections in those States where it is impossible to raise that fruit at all, and certainly not not profitably. This map would shade those sections.

Mr. BACON. That is quite correct; and in this country, where we have so many facilities for intercommunication, for change of residence, and all that, we have a great many people in the Northwest, for instance, who are looking toward the fruit section, desiring to enter into that industry, and it is very important for them to know to what particular section they should direct their attention. In the same way there are those possibly in the South who want to go into a section where they can engage in the sugar-beet industry and things of that kind.

I will now return to the question of expenditure. The amount involved here is certainly small compared with other expenditures which are made for other industries. The Senator from New Hampshire rather makes an attack on the Senator from South Carolina on the ground that there is universal condemnation by him of the tariff, that it is all robbery, etc.

Within certain legitimate bounds the tariff is not robbery; certainly where it is intended for the purpose of raising revenue it is not. But I want to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the difference in the amount of expenditure—practically expenditure, for if it does not come directly out of the

Treasury, at least it comes out of the pockets of the people—that the legislation of this country secures for the manufacturing interest. I am not attacking that interest in any way, but I just wish to make the contrast. As the Senator from North Dakota says, it is impracticable that the farmers can have any benefit from the protective tariff; and it is a fact that some \$250,000,000 or \$300,000,000 a year is paid by the people of the United States in the way of tariff duties, all of which goes directly or indirectly for the benefit of those manufacturers, and it is a fact which I presume will be readily recognized that in addition to these direct taxes in the enhanced price of goods—I am speaking generally, not of all classes, of course—the enhanced price will represent two or three times as much—I think it is a conservative estimate—as the amount of the tariff. So that we have from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 every year contributed by the people of the United States for the benefit of the manufacturing classes.

I am not saying anything against the manufacturing classes. We have a great amount of manufacturing in my own State. I am very much gratified with that, and it is a growing interest. I am simply calling attention to it in order that we may realize the vast difference between the amount which, directly or indirectly, the manufacturing classes enjoy in comparison with that which the agricultural classes can enjoy from the Government and the people of the United States.

We have here an appropriation of some \$90,000,000, which affrights Senators who more particularly represent the manufacturing sections of the country, when the fact is that the manufacturing interests are, directly or indirectly, benefited at the expense of the people of the United States by from \$750,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 a year.

What the Senator from New Hampshire says is correct, that the Republican party will be held responsible for the aggregate of expenditures. There is no doubt about that. But the Senator is incorrect when he suggests that we on this side of the Chamber are always ready and willing to join with them in swelling the amount of expenditure. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that upon this side we are not only making the most strenuous effort to save the Republican party from the expenditure of some two or three hundred million dollars, which they would incur if they passed the ship-subsidy bill, but to that extent we are endeavoring to keep down their expenditures, and are doing that which will ultimately be to their own interest; and the amount which we expect to save in the defeat of the ship-subsidy bill is one so much larger than the amount required for this slight benefit to the agricultural classes that they can scarcely be mentioned in the same breath.

But, Mr. President, the legitimate question—and I return to it only for the purpose of emphasizing what I said in the beginning—is whether or not this is a good point of order which has been made against the amendment. I repeat that under the section of the Revised Statutes which says that the Agricultural Department is organized for the purpose of acquiring and diffusing “among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word”—I say that under that section there can be no question of the fact that this appropriation is directly in furtherance of existing law and made for the purpose of carrying out existing law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I had almost begun to fear that, owing to his interest in agriculture, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] had lost sight of the point of order, but he returned to it finally. I think, therefore, that he and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] have taken such good care of it there is no danger of its dying of neglect, although I think they are wrong in their contention, for it seems to me the point of order lies against the amendment.

I did not, however, rise for the purpose of discussing the point of order, nor for the purpose of discussing the details of this appropriation or its agricultural merits. It seems to me there is a bill on this Calendar at this moment which is a great deal more valuable to the farmers than this appropriation can ever be, which would not cost the Government anything, and which would tend to honesty in our sales of food products. I wish some of this fervent agricultural interest was given to that.

Mr. SPOONER. What bill is that?

Mr. LODGE. The oleomargarine bill; what is known as the Grout bill. It is not a bill which involves any expenditure. I think it would promote pure food. I shall not discuss the details of the bill. I think it would be of very great benefit to the farmers of this country; but on neither of these two points, neither the point of order nor the merits of the appropriation, do I desire now to say a word.

I do not like, Mr. President, to hear sneers at economy. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who spoke in favor of greater economy in appropriations, is not an unreasonable man in those respects, and I think the warning he has given possesses a gravity which we ought all to heed without regard to party.

The appropriations are mounting up to an enormous figure. There are certain appropriations which ought to take precedence of all others, in my judgment—appropriations for the defense of the country, for our fortifications, for our Navy, for our Army, for the proper conduct of the Government. I have never been one of those who has hesitated to vote ample appropriations in every direction where they were necessary for the promotion of the public defense or the maintenance of the dignity and the power of the Government at home and abroad.

There are many other subjects of appropriations, however, amongst which we may choose and which are not immediately essential. I think, Mr. President, that anyone who looks attentively at the present conditions of our appropriations and those which are proposed will see the dangers into which we are running. Here, for example, is a river and harbor bill now pending in the committee. We know what it brought from the House; we do not know what it will bring to the Senate. There are appropriations needed, greatly needed, for the Mississippi, for certain of our great ports on the Atlantic and the Pacific, for all those improvements which tend to cheapen transportation, and in cheapening of transportation lies the ability of the United States to compete successfully with our trade and commercial rivals. But yet, Mr. President, it is an open secret that that bill as it came from the House of Representatives—I do not say what our committee is going to do—but that bill as it came from the other House is in danger of failure because it is loaded down with appropriations beyond any reason, for purposes which are not immediate and which are not imperative.

I feel at liberty to say this, Mr. President, because nobody has a greater interest in the passage of the river and harbor bill than I have, owing to the appropriations made for the harbor of Boston, the second port in exports and imports in the United States—appropriations which are absolutely vital to our commerce and to the commerce of vast regions of the country. But I can not close my eyes to the fact that the bill has been loaded so indiscriminately that it is now in imminent danger of failure. The reason of it is the unceasing cry, the unreasoning pressure, from every possible harbor and every possible river in this country, driving on members of the House and of the Senate to demand appropriations to such an extent that good and bad are likely to go down together.

Again, Mr. President, we are building up a series of new industries in this country quite different from the industries that have grown up under the tariff; one is the industry of expositions. The United States makes an appropriation for an international exposition at Chicago, very properly—one representing the whole country. The example is alluring. Another exposition is held here, another there, and another elsewhere. Expositions have become an industry, and they are planted and they grow in the Treasury of the United States—\$5,000,000 for St. Louis, \$500,000 for Buffalo, \$250,000 for Charleston. If you give to one, you ought to give to all the others. So there is a great new industry which is growing up, and every town and city in the United States is coming forward to have its turn. If this continues, it is difficult to imagine the vast expenditure which will ensue. This new industry must be checked.

We have a great many battlefields in this country—battlefields of the Revolution, battlefields of the civil war, places of immense interest to the people of this country. One or two of them have properly been taken as monuments of the wars of the United States and of great historical events. Now there has sprung up an industry of selling battlefields to the United States. A great real-estate movement in battlefields has set in, backed by local interests, and playing upon patriotic sentiment for success.

There is also a continual pressure here to have the United States go about in the different States and raise monuments to local heroes or in commemoration of local events. This is a particularly good place for economy.

I have a sympathy with many of these objects; I have voted for many of them; but, Mr. President, they are not necessary to this Government. We are running on and exercising no discrimination in our appropriations; they are mounting up; they will be \$750,000,000, we are told. I am not an expert in the matter of appropriations, but we are pushing on toward billion-dollar appropriations in a single session. We have got to draw the line somewhere. We must first make up our minds as to what appropriations the country, the whole country, needs, those where economies ought not to be practiced, where, indeed, economies would be worse than extravagance. Then let us see where we can economize. There is a wide field. We are running into an amount of appropriations which is beginning to alarm the country.

It has been said here this morning that the Republican party would be held responsible for these extravagant appropriations. Of course they will, and properly so. They are the party in power; they are the party in control of both Houses of Congress; they will be held responsible and ought to be held responsible; and they

ought to look well where they are going with these great appropriations in every direction.

But, Mr. President, there is something broader and larger in this than party, and that is the country. We ought to look more attentively, I think, at where we are spending the public money; we ought to see that the needless is not appropriated for. The necessary should be first attended to, the superfluous cast off, and those not immediately necessary reduced to reasonable limits.

It is not an idle statement which the Senator from Maine has made here this morning, and it is not a statement to be sneered at or laughed out of court by men of either party. It is a very, very grave question, and in the days that remain to us of the session this Senate ought to look to it that a mass of needless appropriations is not heaped upon the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President, for my part, let me say that I did not give utterance to anything, I think, which could be construed into a sneer in regard to what the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] had to say here this morning. I deeply sympathize with that Senator, and also with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in regard to these appropriations.

I have never advocated large and extravagant appropriations in any respect. The argument I used this morning was that this provision carried an appropriation recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture upon the solicitation of the farmers of the country. I have faith in the Secretary of Agriculture. He himself is a farmer, and knows the needs of the farmers of this country certainly better, I think, than a great many Senators in this body.

Mr. President, I suppose that I should confine myself to the point of order; but I am not going to speak on the point of order, because I think the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]—and I am always glad to agree with the Senator from Georgia if I can—have covered that point.

I do not believe that this provision is subject to the point of order, because the House of Representatives has legislated upon this question and the Senate has legislated upon it. The Committee on Agriculture merely brought a provision here which was amendatory of the provision which came from the House of Representatives. I do not concede, therefore, that it is new legislation.

To return for a moment, Mr. President, to the question of extravagance. The Senator from Maine, as I have stated, is deserving the sympathy of the Senate for his efforts in the line of economy. I thought the other day, when the Senator arose here and asked for the passage of a bill for the establishment of a lobster hatchery in Maine, that he was a little extravagant in that regard, but I may be wrong. I did not say anything about it. I thought I would let it go, because I have great respect for the wisdom of the Senator from Maine. He usually knows what he wants, and he usually gets what he goes after. So I concluded not to interfere with his lobster hatchery, yet I have grave apprehensions about it. Who can tell where it will end and what it will cost?

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator from Maine likes broiled lobster. [Laughter.]

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I know, on the other hand, that the people of New England require lobster. They have reached that æsthetic stage, Mr. President, where they can not get along without lobster. They must have sea food, and plenty of it. [Laughter.] I sympathize with them, or rather, I mean to say, I am glad that they have succeeded in getting their lobster hatchery.

Out in the Western country, whence I come, we like fish also, but catfish is good enough for us for a while. We may reach the lobster stage ourselves some day, and I hope we shall. [Laughter.] Meantime we want to protect the institution of agriculture.

I am going to refer again to my own State briefly. The Secretary of Agriculture some eight or ten years ago made an investigation in regard to the adaptability of the soil of North Dakota to the culture of the sugar beet. Before that time, if anyone had suggested that we could raise sugar beets in that northern clime it would have been cause for derision and smiles; but after those investigations it was developed that the sugar beet could be raised in that country, and that the beet which was raised there contained a larger degree of saccharine matter than the beet raised in almost any other clime.

What is the result? We are establishing to-day beet-sugar factories in the State of North Dakota as the result of the investigations of the Secretary of Agriculture, encouraged by the appropriations coming from Congress.

I do not believe that this enterprise of soil investigations is going to grow into the extravagant appropriations referred to by the Senator from Maine. I doubt if it will exceed the present sum asked for; and, if so, I think it will exceed it but very little. Of course, we are asking for more this year than we did last year; but, as I stated this morning, it is an easy matter to get over the agricultural sections of the country. The time is near at hand when, through the encouragement of Congress, the Secretary of

Agriculture will be able to have the entire agricultural region examined, and to have reports upon the adaptability of its soil, chemically, industrially, and otherwise.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, the Senator in charge of this bill informs us that the whole expense of the Bureau of Soils will be about \$91,000.

Mr. PROCTOR. Aside from salaries.

Mr. CAFFERY. Aside from salaries.

Mr. PROCTOR. The total expenditure is \$109,000, and \$91,000 is for investigations.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, there is no branch of industry in the United States that has progressed so rapidly as agriculture. As the soils of the new States become worn out it is necessary to apply advanced methods of cultivation to the old soils. It is further necessary, in view of the development of the results from the scientific application of fertilizers to the soils, that the texture of all soils in the United States should be thoroughly understood. Everybody knows, or ought to know, that soils have three essential elements of plant food—phosphoric acid, ammonia, and potash. Soils that are destitute of one or other of these essential plant foods ought to be supplied with them by commercial or other fertilizers.

As a remarkable instance of what can be effected out of soils, I will cite the growth and culture of the sugar beet in Germany. When that plant was first introduced there from France, it having been brought over to France by Napoleon when he returned from Egypt, there was only 7 per cent of saccharine in the sugar beet. The Germans now, by the application of proper fertilizer, have increased that percentage nearly 300 per cent. They have got up as high as 18 per cent of saccharine. This therefore demonstrates the necessity of an examination of the soil, the texture of the soil, the component parts of the soil, what fertilizing properties they possess, and what fertilizing properties are necessary to their development if they do not possess the requisite quantities.

Now, again, as to the effect of climate upon soil, I read a very interesting account a few years ago of an experiment made by a French chemist, and it was about this: He took a willow twig and a box of dirt, dried the dirt, expelled every particle of moisture from it. He weighed the twig and he weighed the dirt. After doing that he put the twig in the dirt, watered both, and continued to water the twig during its growth. After the twig had grown into some proportions, he weighed both the dirt and the twig, as he had done at the start. It was discovered that the twig had grown in weight about 16 pounds and the dirt had lost a couple of ounces. That shows the necessity of these climatic investigations—what part the atmosphere performs in plant growth. So we perceive that this provision for the examination of the texture of the soil and the climatic influences upon plants is one of great necessity.

Again, there is provision made for examining into seepage and drainage. That occurs to me to be a very important branch. I read in the Encyclopædia Britannica some years ago of the experiments made by the British Government in the matter of underdrainage, affecting seepage and drainage generally, and from the results of the examinations made by the Government it was ascertained that common soils would produce 50 per cent more of product by underdrainage than without it. So this underdrainage is very necessary. Underdrainage is being resorted to throughout the West to a very considerable extent. Who except the farmer from Maine and the other farmer from Massachusetts—I suppose him to be a farmer in some lines—grudges the farmer this pittance of \$91,000 or \$109,000 to make an investigation into all these matters to discover the influence of climate and the influence of drainage on all plant life?

Mr. President, anything that benefits the farmer is not in the line of extravagance. He is the backbone of all our industries. Whatever benefits him benefits the whole community, and any appropriation looking toward his benefit, any appropriation giving him enlightenment, telling him what to do with the soil, what sort of soil he has, how he can manage it, what fertilizer to apply to it, is a provision not in the line of extravagance, but a provision in the line of economy. Whatever increases the product of the farm decreases the price of the product to the consumer.

We have been treated to two lectures, one of a paternal, fatherly, kindly sort, from the Senator from Maine. He says he is a farmer; and perforce we must take his admonitions in the spirit in which he gave them. We will take them with as much docility as he administered them with kindness. But I venture to say that the Senator from Maine is not the kind of a farmer that the Senator from South Carolina is. The Senator from South Carolina has signalized his farming in the way that the ancient Greek signalized his having a brick house. He carried a brick in his pocket, and the Senator from South Carolina flourishes his pitchfork on every occasion. What sort of a fork the Senator from Maine uses I do not know. I presume it is a silver fork, with which he handles those dainty lobsters which the Senator from

North Dakota says supply the delicate appetite of the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

But the Senator from Massachusetts has not stopped at lecturing on general grounds. He has taken up specific grounds on which to lecture us. He has stated, however, that there is no expenditure that he will not support which can advance the general interest of the United States in the way of warlike armaments, as I suppose from his utterance, or in the way of providing for the common defense, which I suppose to be the extension of our boundaries and waging war against these subject peoples. But he singles out for his peculiar condemnation the river and harbor appropriations. Then he attacks the exposition feature of our extravagance, as he terms it, and then he invades the sanctuary of the grave and attacks the provisions that have been made for erecting into national parks the places where the great battles of the civil war were fought. I am glad, Mr. President, that I have no part or lot in that sort of economy. Without knowing, I believe, any of the details of the river and harbor bill, the junior Senator from Massachusetts has attacked its provision en masse, with the only exception of appropriations for the harbors on the seacoast. He has said that there were extravagant and unjustifiable appropriations made for streams that had no need of them.

I am one of the members of the Committee on Commerce, and I venture to say that while there may be a very few exceptional cases the mass of the appropriations are not only legitimate, but they are inadequate to the commercial needs of the locality where they are to be applied. We have to do two things in order to bring our commerce into actual transportation. We have to provide the means of communication from the point of production, and then we have to provide the means of transportation from a point on the seaboard from which the products are to be exported. An appropriation at the point of production is as valuable, if not more so, than an appropriation at the point of shipment to foreign countries. And why not? This is the only means that the American people have now to get competition with the great railroads that go from ocean to ocean, from the center of the country to the seaboard, and which, as everybody knows, have a trust on freights.

It behooves the American people in the line of economy so to improve the waterways as to afford a check, as to afford a barrier upon the gigantic trusts of the railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission in every single report it makes says that the railroads discriminate in the teeth of the law. They charge more for a short than for a long haul. They discriminate in favor of one port as against another, one city as against another, and the only complete and perfect competition you can have against them, the only barrier or bar against their exactions, is a development of the waterways of the United States.

None of us, sir, have sneered, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, about the extravagance of the Republican party. We do not sneer at it, sir. We are sorry for it. It is with sorrow that we see these enormous subsidies asked to be voted for in this body. A subsidy of a hundred and fifty million dollars, running up to three or four hundred million dollars, is nothing to the junior Senator from Massachusetts, but an appropriation to open the waterways of the country to commerce is something to the junior Senator from Massachusetts. I, sir, have no part in that spirit which charges extravagance to the American Congress for voting appropriations to mark with fitting memorial the last resting place of the heroes of the civil war. Every nation upon earth has done tribute to its dead. It goes outside of the law of ordinary legislation and it appeals to the best elements and best motives of human nature. Who regrets of those who wore the gray that the field upon which the valor of the South was exhibited should be decorated by the common contribution of the taxpayers of the United States?

I do not regret it, and I do not believe this pitiful economy advocated by the Senator from Massachusetts will be upheld by those of noble sentiments, by those who appreciate the valor of the dead, whom I see before me upon the Republican side. This is the sort of economy we are asked to practice, and we are asked to go into the extravagance of voting untold millions—for no man on earth knows what this subsidy will amount to in the end—to a lot of shipowners and shipbuilders who need no contribution from the American people.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, speaking to the point of order in the same style in which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] did, I wish to say I am exceedingly gratified to find a man on the other side of the Chamber who is so devotedly attached to economy. He is working a good vein, and I hope it will not peter out before he has substantial returns from his labor.

But I think it is a pretty bad idea to begin his economy right upon an Agricultural appropriation bill, in a matter which is really of great importance to half the population of the United States. I suppose he has ransacked the soils of his State, so that there is no longer any necessity for a chemical investigation or an investigation of any other sort. In half of the State you would have to pulverize stone in order to get material for a chemical expert

to work on. But still there is something to be done in New England. It may be determined which species of white oak makes the best nutmeg, or how much cabbage should go into a Connecticut cigar to make it smokable. A great many things may be done for New England, although for a long time we have been devoting the resources of this country to her benefit, not only with experiments, but with things that go beyond that. There is a bill here, mainly for New England, which carries a sum of money the amount of which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] finds it impossible to state. I suppose he means because the sum total of it would simply shock and stagger the credulity of the Senate.

I am myself an economist, but I do not want to start with the farmers of the United States. I can say, however, that I am perfectly willing to join with the Senator from Massachusetts in stopping the extravagant expenditures for which the Republican party must assuredly be responsible, as he states. I will tell him that the way to do it is to stop that policy of the Republican party which requires over a hundred million dollars a year for both the Army and the Navy, designed to kill a part of the people of a country which a hundred years ago was to most of the people of the United States as far off as the moon, in order that the balance of them may be reduced to subjection. That would be a wholesale economy and one compatible with the national honor and the national interest.

The Senator looks upon the river and harbor bill as an offense to the Senate—at least to himself. Well, it may have its faults. Some obscure stream that can not afford navigation for ducks in high water will probably be surveyed, but hardly appropriated for. However, it is to the Senator from Massachusetts a very unseemly aggregate of expense. But that bill, as bad as it is—

Like the toad, ugly and venomous,
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head.

And that jewel to him is Boston Harbor. For its sake he will probably be able to tolerate it. I am willing to begin to cut down the river and harbor bill. I am willing to begin with Boston Harbor and leave that off this year and reduce the expenditures somewhat, if there is a real desire for retrenchment and reform in the matter of the river and harbor bill. I am myself a devoted advocate of that bill, and I do not believe, with all its mistakes, which are developed only by the engineers of the corps in their service and not by the committee, that any money has ever been expended by the United States which has brought so large a return to the people as has that appropriated on the river and harbor bill.

Mr. President, as far as concerns this provision here, I think it is in order. It is in order as an amendment to a proposition of the House, and we are certainly capable of amending any proposition that comes to us from the House. They more jealously guard against intrusion of new matter, and there points of order are more rigidly maintained than has been the practice at any time in this Chamber, and so, in that point of view, it is not subject to the point of order. In fact, that is not the matter talked about. It is simply upon the merits of the proposition, and Senators have taken particular pains to confine themselves to the merits of it and not to the point of order, because they saw, in my opinion, that it was untenable. It is a mistake to say the farmers do not want this. The Senator from South Carolina explained a while ago that there is a great demand for it from his country.

Then there are some other things that might be done. Inasmuch as the Senator from Massachusetts has got his hand in he might help to ratify some of these reciprocity treaties. There are 13 or 14 of them. One of them has been on the Calendar ever since last May. It is a measure which, in my opinion, will do more for American trade with France than all the treaties we have ever negotiated with it. The reciprocity treaties were mentioned in the Republican platform. This provision is in the Dingley Act and it was in the McKinley Act, and yet we find it dying; and not only that one, but 13 others that have been negotiated by order of the President, under the authority of the Dingley Act, by a most accomplished diplomatist, Mr. Kasson, also a Republican. I have never seen in the Committee on Foreign Relations a solitary Democratic member of either House protesting against this reciprocity, but the room is full of Republicans who do not want it. I have stood there in the attitude of the only man supporting the Republican platform, the Dingley Act, the McKinley Act, the Administration, and its negotiator, Mr. Kasson. One way to extend the commerce of this country is to give it the open door to other countries, and the concessions made would have been of such tremendous importance to this country that the subsidy bill would sink into insignificance.

The Senator went out of his way to say that we ought to pass the oleomargarine bill. Why? Because it is unconstitutional? Because it is class legislation? Because it tries to tax out of existence a wholesome, lawful, nutritious product which millions of people can consume who can not buy butter, or what is the reason? There is no particular economy in it. It does not save the

Government a cent. On the contrary, it affects to be and pretends to be a measure to raise revenue, not to reduce it. Of course the pretext is a fraudulent one. It is just as false as any oleomargarine that ever was colored or any butter that was ever colored.

Now, when it comes to economy, I have shown the subjects upon which it can be practiced. But if the Republican party want to do it, if they wish to follow the lead of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maine, as distinguished as they are, instead of the veteran Senator from Vermont, and to cut down right here where the farmers are concerned, let them do it and take the consequences. I shall stand here, however, in the interest of the farmers. I shall stand defending and championing the integrity and the intelligence and the economy of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, who knows what he is doing, and I do not believe ever misappropriated a solitary dollar. He has been gradually extending his work, and this is a part of the extension. We are not going to stop at this. The next year's bill will be still more, just as the gentlemen anticipate. You can rest assured that now is the time to kill the snake. You need not scotch it, because as the Department grows in importance and in usefulness and as it grows in the affection of the people of the United States there will be continually more demand for this sort of experimental work which has begun now. It is not going to stop. Sneers and objections will not stop it. The people are determined to have these very things. I feel quite safe in following the lead of the Senator from Vermont on this question, and I feel very safe in following the recommendations made by the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture.

I will have to stop speaking, Mr. President, because I can not speak any longer.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I listened to the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire, who presented a new consideration on the question of order, and he called attention to a fact which I had not observed, as I had not examined the bill carefully, which was that in this case, instead of introducing an absolute amendment, a new amendment, as it appears to be on pages 32 and 33, in italics, the committee has simply struck out the House provision, instead of amending it, as is customarily done, so that the amendment would appear with the House provision, and in another place had inserted a substitute for that. I find on turning to page 30 that from line 8 forward to line 16 on the next page the bill of the House provided, not in terms, but generally, for this same subject-matter, and that the committee in charge of the bill has simply amplified and extended those provisions. I think they have made a mistake. I think that they are embarking, as I said, in a new field, and a very wide field, and I shall not vote for their provision; but I do not think—and I am bound to say so—that under those conditions their amendment is subject to a point of order. It is simply amplifying and extending a House provision, and of course we can make no point of order on whatever the House does. I am still very firm in my opinion that we are embarking in very dangerous legislation, but I do not think it is subject to the point of order. In fact, had I known just what the situation was, I should not have raised the point of order.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator withdraw the point of order?

Mr. HALE. Yes. I can not withdraw it if anybody else insists upon it; but I do not think it applies.

Mr. TELLER. I think it will lie, and I think the Senator has omitted to discover that this is an independent proposition. It is entirely distinct from the House provision, which was in last year. It is an innovation, and every word that I propose to strike out is new. Every word goes to create a new order. Take the first line:

Investigation of the relation of soils to climate and organic life.

That is the gist of the whole thing. Now, then, it goes on:

For the investigation of the texture and composition of soils in the field and laboratory; for the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts.

Mr. HALE. That is in the House provision?

Mr. TELLER. That is in the House provision. Then it proceeds:

The investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters and of methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters in irrigated districts.

If you will skip what I propose to strike out and go down and take the amendment that was adopted after the word "Territory," in line 15, then you have the House proposition of last year. But you have inserted inside of this an entirely distinct proposition, which is not for the investigation of soils, but for the mapping of the country. It is an entirely different thing—just as different as it can be.

Now, Mr. President, while I am talking on this subject I wish to say that all this anxiety for farmers and all this talk about there being economy used against the farmer upon this bill is simply absurd. The great interests of the farmer are protected in this bill without this provision. This is absolutely of no benefit to the farmer, and if it is carried out as proposed it will take away from what ought to be appropriations for the farmer a large

amount of money that otherwise we might hope to get for him. They are doing a work that is of no value, and the farmer knows nothing about it. It is not proposed to prevent the Department from investigating soils. That they have been doing, and that they have a right to do under this law, and they will do it if the amendment of the Senate committee is stricken out. But it will not allow them to introduce an entirely new system of surveying and mapping the United States.

Mr. HALE. What are the amendments the Senator has proposed? I had certain amendments to offer.

Mr. TELLER. I propose to strike out, in line 6, the words "to map the soils of the United States," down to and including the word "Territory," in line 15, which, as I said, then leaves that section as the House presented it. It does not touch anything that the House put in and it leaves the section perfect. This disjoins the whole provision by putting in another requirement between the investigation of the soil and the investigation of tobacco land.

Mr. HALE. Has the Senator moved to strike out in lines 15 and 16 the words "to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries?"

Mr. TELLER. I have not done so, because that is in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator does not move to strike out that clause, I propose to strike it out, not upon a point of order, but on motion, because I do not want it in.

Mr. TELLER. I undertook to strike out only what the Senate committee has inflicted upon us that was not in the House bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. I wish the Senator would let me finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will not think I am intruding with any desire at all to interrupt him, but I wish to call his attention to an error into which he has dropped, where he says the House provision—

Mr. TELLER. Well, I will listen, if I am in error.

Mr. TILLMAN. He says that the House provision does not embrace authority to map the soils of the United States.

Mr. TELLER. If it does I have overlooked it.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will look on line 16, page 30, he will see the words "to map the tobacco soils of the United States."

Mr. TELLER. That is quite different.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well; then let us restore the word "tobacco" and leave it as it was in the House provision down to the word "Provided," and then strike out from "Provided" down to "investigate," on line 15. I am certain that the mapping of the tobacco soils of the United States, which was authorized by the House, is a very valuable work, and it could be prosecuted with great benefit to the people of this country.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator had followed it, we have already made an amendment to line 15 which includes tobacco soils exactly as the provision is, I understand, in the House bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Line 15 on what page?

Mr. TELLER. On page 33. I have no objection to the mapping of tobacco soils. That is a matter of small consequence compared with the mapping of the arable land of the United States.

Mr. PROCTOR. That has been inserted.

Mr. TELLER. It has been inserted.

Mr. HALE. Where has that been inserted?

Mr. TILLMAN. Where has it been inserted?

Mr. TELLER. After the word "Territory," in line 15.

Mr. HALE. On page 33?

Mr. TELLER. On page 33.

Mr. HALE. Let us see: "That not less than one field's season work"

Mr. TILLMAN. What have you inserted—to investigate and map the soils?

Mr. TELLER. Let the Secretary read what was inserted.

The SECRETARY. The Senate has agreed to the following amendment:

Page 33, line 15, after the word "Territory" and the semicolon, insert:

To map the tobacco soils of the United States.

Mr. TELLER. That is in the bill, and it was put in yesterday on the motion of some Senator on the other side, I think.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then, were the words "to map the soils of the United States," in line 6, stricken out?

Mr. TELLER. No; my motion is to strike out that clause.

Mr. HALE. That clause should be stricken out, of course, because there is no sense in limiting it to tobacco soils when you have a provision that covers all soils. Of course the words "to map the soils of the United States" should be stricken out.

Mr. SPOONER. The reason why it was left in that way is because the mapping of tobacco soils has already begun to some extent, I understand.

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. And it seemed to be the general opinion that that work ought to be finished.

Mr. HALE. That would be included clearly in the phrase "to map the soils of the United States."

Mr. SPOONER. But that would leave it entirely in the discretion of the Secretary to abandon the work already begun.

Mr. PETTUS. Mr. President, we can not hear this conversation.

Mr. HALE. Does the committee propose to agree to strike out the words "to map the soils of the United States," so that this mapping shall be confined to tobacco soils?

Mr. PROCTOR. No.

Mr. HALE. The committee does not agree to that.

Mr. TELLER. That is what I said. The committee will not agree to that.

Mr. SPOONER. But it was agreed yesterday that the provision continuing the work of mapping tobacco soils should not be eliminated.

Mr. HALE. Not as a limitation.

Mr. TELLER. No; not as a limitation. It is a specific direction. That is all there is about it.

I was saying, when interrupted by the Senator from South Carolina, that if this new scheme of a general map is stricken out it will be left practically as it was last session. It will leave it where the House left it exactly, and we shall not have this new system of mapping and surveying the United States, provided we should turn over on the next page and strike out something there. But if we left that in it would probably apply to tobacco land and a survey of it.

Senators say, like the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] a few moments ago, that they are willing to trust the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. President, this is a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to go to work and map all the arable land in the United States—not tobacco land, not wheat land, not land adapted to some peculiar plant, but the whole arable region of the United States. It either will break down the whole agricultural system or it will be worthless. If we fail, of course, to make appropriations for it next year it may be that it will stop; but if we make an appropriation now for beneficial purposes, all of it may be diverted, if the administration sees fit, for the purpose of making these maps. If this is to be valuable at all, if there is to be any benefit in mapping the soil, then there should be a million dollars in this bill instead of ninety thousand dollars.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Mr. President—

Mr. TELLER. For a million dollars would not be of any benefit in time for the present generation to do very much. A million dollars a year would not do very much. I will hear what the Senator from North Dakota wishes to say.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I desire to ask the Senator, with his permission, if he does not think there is a wide distinction between mapping the country for this purpose and mapping it for topographical purposes? The two maps will not resemble each other in the least. This work will be done very easily, and it will not cost a great deal of money.

Mr. TELLER. I know something about the mapping. If you do anything here that is to be of any value, you have got to have every section of the country, every township and every section in the township, included in your map; and you have got to determine what that land is. Of course you can take the results of surveys, where they have been made, but you have got to make a map. It is not a map, as was suggested by some one here, where the Secretary would take a whole State and say, "That will raise wheat," or "that will raise corn," or something else. Some of the States raise wheat in better quantities in one county than in another, and the whole thing is to be done up in that way. Here is a county in which they say better beets are raised than they will raise somewhere else. It requires an amount of labor that will be absolutely impossible under this appropriation or any other that you will be likely to get.

Now, Mr. President, I spoke of the beet industry yesterday. I wanted a little more appropriation for the investigation of the diseases of beets. I was told by the Secretary that could not be done; that we have so much in the bill we must not do that. That is a question of a great deal of importance. If we can raise beets in this country, as we think we can, to the extent that I believe is possible, that is a very great industry for us. I am not going at this time, though, to discuss the beet question. I only rose to say that my motion to strike out is to strike out an entirely new proposition, a new feature of the bill, which if it is not legislation it is not possible to have any legislation.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, there is a very mistaken idea about what this mapping is, and I think the vivid imagination of the Senator from Maine conjures up a danger of which there need be no apprehension. It is not in any proper sense a survey and a mapping as we understand those terms. It is an examination of a single specimen of soil in some valley, a careful analysis and examination of it, then a comparison with samples in the same sec-

tion, and then the coloring of the map which we already have, covering the sections which seem to be practically identical in character. The work that has already been done shows this. For instance, in California 630 square miles around Fresno have been surveyed and mapped, and 200 square miles around Santa Ana. In Utah 250 square miles were surveyed and mapped in Salt Lake County, and 200 square miles around Ogden. In Connecticut 450 square miles, embracing the tobacco district of the Connecticut Valley, have been surveyed and mapped; and in North Carolina a strip of land about 100 miles long and 10 miles broad, 1,000 square miles, passing through the wheat lands, the cotton soil, and the bright tobacco area and the swamp area of the coast.

In Maryland the soils of Cecil, Kent, Calvert, and St. Mary counties have been surveyed and mapped. Work of this kind has also been done in Kentucky. In Pennsylvania an area of 235 square miles in Lancaster County; in Ohio, Montgomery County, the Miami Valley. In Louisiana a thousand square miles have been surveyed and mapped with the cooperation of the experiment station of that kind, and in Arizona 250 square miles. There are other examples, but that is sufficient to show what it is.

Mr. HALE. Then, instead of having this phrase, which is very embracing and very searching, "to map the soils of the United States," will the Senator consent—if not, I shall move the amendment—to make it read "to investigate the soils of the United States and for sketches illustrating said investigation." I would have no objection to that language.

Mr. SPOONER. What would that mean? Pamphlets?

Mr. HALE. There will be pamphlets, of course; there is no doubt about that; but they can sketch their illustrations instead of calling it mapping, which, as I said, is very far searching. It may allow them to do not only what the Senator from Vermont says they are doing now, but they may go on beyond that and make accurate maps. I can not conceive that they can make a map of the soils of the United States on any such light investigation as the Senator has indicated they are doing. They do not make a map; it is no use; it is not in the line; but if they want to make some investigation and then give us sketches illustrating those investigations and can go over superficially hundreds of miles in a few days, I have no great objection to that. The thing that is at the bottom of my objection here is not that I am unwilling to give a small sum for this purpose, but that I am profoundly impressed with the danger of starting on this wide enterprise.

Mr. SPOONER. How would it do to say, "Indicate on maps, by color or otherwise, the results of such investigation?"

Mr. HALE. That would cover it.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is satisfactory.

Mr. HALE. That would cover it. Let it read: "For investigation of the soils of the United States, and to indicate upon maps"

Mr. SPOONER. "By color or otherwise, the results of such investigation."

Mr. HALE. "Indicate upon maps the result of such investigation."

Mr. SPOONER. "By color or otherwise."

Mr. HALE. "By color or otherwise."

Mr. TELLER. Let us have a ruling on the question of order.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I confess that I can not share in the apprehension of the Senator from Colorado, who seems to be laboring under the idea that in order to make an appropriate map under this provision it will be necessary to go with a spade upon every section of land in the United States and have the soil analyzed.

It seems to me that the most important feature to be determined by the Secretary under the provision is climatic conditions. We well know that there is a great stretch of arid country unfit for any purpose, no matter what the soil may be. We also well know that the greater portion of it would be adapted to a great many purposes were we able to furnish the requisite amount of water. It appears to me that we already have knowledge, and that knowledge is especially within the hand of the Secretary of Agriculture, as to the climatic conditions, and in a great many respects as to the soil conditions of the whole country. With the knowledge he has at the present time quite an accurate map, it seems to me, might be made, with full instructions, so that we could understand it very readily.

Mr. President, there is another matter that I wish to speak of briefly, and that is the question of extravagance. After listening to the very earnest speech of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I am convinced that no extravagant appropriation has been included in the river and harbor bill for any harbor or river in the State of Massachusetts. In my own State our harbors are few, and this is to be taken in connection with the fact that no appropriation whatever is made for the State in the river and harbor bill for this year, and we can not be accused of desiring to vote for anything extravagant in supporting this amendment.

The question of extravagance seems to me almost always to be

a question of comparisons. When I see that the Senator from Maine introduced a bill here for a lobster hatchery, with an expense of \$10,000, and when I compare the lobster industry in the United States with the corn industry, with the wheat industry, with the hog industry, with the cattle industry, with the cotton industry, it seems to me that a \$10,000 appropriation for a lobster hatchery is away out of proportion, when you consider that we have here an appropriation of only \$91,000 for all the agricultural interests in the United States.

The same thing might be said of the fisheries. I believe that where we expend \$1 for the real agricultural interest in the United States, comparatively, we spend \$1,000 for the fish industry. So, Mr. President, it does not appear to me to be in any way extravagant if we vote \$91,000 for the direct benefit of all the agricultural interests in the United States, and I can not see why it should be considered in any light as extravagant. We desire to know the character of the soil, and especially the climatic conditions in any section of the United States, so that any person may know, without going through an expensive experiment, just what character of crops we may raise in that particular section.

I wish to say a word, also, in answer to the statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], in which he indicated at least that my remarks a short time ago were to the effect that the agricultural interests could receive no benefit from tariff legislation. The Senator certainly was mistaken if he so understood me. I meant simply that they could receive no direct benefit, but certainly I would not for a single moment admit that anything which gives general prosperity to all of the country will not incidentally benefit all the agricultural class. What I mean to express is that if we raise double the number of bushels of wheat in the United States that can be consumed here we can give but very little protection to it, because we must export at least one-half of the grain raised; and therefore the greatest protection we can accord to the agricultural industries is such legislation as will enable them to raise a greater quantity of their products or to raise products of a character, by reason of an investigation, which it was supposed before could not be raised. It seems to me that we are entitled, as a matter of right, to this very moderate sum for that particular purpose.

Now, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] says the bill does not propose to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from making the investigation anyway. But he can not make the investigation unless funds are provided for it. The number of dollars provided for this purpose, when compared with the importance of the agricultural interest with other interests, seems to me to be so slight that every Senator ought to vote for the provision with a feeling that there is no extravagance whatever in appropriating this sum.

Mr. RAWLINS. Mr. President, I am certain that I would not object to any provision in this or any other bill which I thought would be of general practical usefulness to the farmers of the country; but it seems to me that there are provisions in the bill which can result in no real benefit to its intended beneficiaries. For instance, I call attention here to one provision with which I happen to be somewhat familiar. Among the purposes to which this money is to be applied is the following:

For the investigation of the cause and prevention of the rise of alkali in the soils of the irrigated districts.

That has direct application to the region of country from which I come. I do not think there is a farmer anywhere in that country who does not understand the cause of the rise of alkali and the means of its prevention. But suppose that were not true, the Geological Bureau, out of the appropriations which Congress has from time to time made to the Interior Department, has entered upon elaborate investigations of this subject, and we here have great volumes already published at the expense of the Government, embracing reports from India and from almost every country where irrigation is carried on throughout the world, giving elaborately and in detail all the information which is now again to be ascertained through the process of this bill under the Department of Agriculture.

I can not understand why we should duplicate these provisions. That investigation has already been made. All that is necessary to dispense this information, if it is not already possessed by the farmers, is to make publication of the results of the investigations that have already taken place. And yet I suppose, notwithstanding the Geological Bureau has made these investigations and is still engaged in that same line, we are now to set up another and a separate bureau and duplicate the work which it has performed.

I do not think that would result in any benefit to the farmers in my section. While I should be glad to vote for anything that would be of public and general advantage to them, I can not conceive of any benefit that can come to the people who irrigate lands in the West from any investigation that may be carried on by virtue of the authority contained in this bill.

Mr. President, lands which contain mineral drain from the sur-

face. Mineral is in solution in the subterranean waters. Every farmer knows that when the waters fill up until they come to the surface, the mineral upon evaporation will be deposited upon the surface, and the lands will become unfit for cultivation. There is not a farmer in the United States who is familiar with this class of land who does not know that if you dig trenches and pour in the water on the surface the mineral will drain out and the lands will be reclaimed. Yet we will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in the end, in my judgment, if we enact this provision, to send men who have no practical experience in this business into the arid regions to conduct these investigations there, and here at Washington we will publish elaborate reports of those things which every man in that country knows already. It is simply a matter of common sense.

They know what causes the mineral to rise and they know what will prevent it from rising, and they know what will reclaim the land. The Senator from Colorado well understands that.

Mr. President, this is a mere pretext. Many of these provisions, in my opinion, are not to benefit the farmer, but to furnish jobs to men who are seeking Government employment. I would be glad to vote for anything that would really result in benefit to the farmers of my section; but I have had no appeal from farmers in my section for any such investigation as the one proposed here. It is true I have received a letter from a prominent officer in my State. He was induced to write me the letter. How? By the importunity of farmers? No; he had received a letter from a man employed in a bureau here at Washington to call upon the Representatives of my State to use our influence in procuring an additional appropriation for purposes of this kind. I am not going to lend myself to propositions of that character. That provision, I think, any man who is familiar with alkali lands or any other kind of land would know can not result in any benefit.

As to mapping, it is said here that it is a general work. A map has been made of about 200 square miles in the vicinity of Salt Lake. But they do not propose to stop with that map; they propose to investigate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator yield to me for a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RAWLINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILLMAN. Is the Senator willing that we should insert a provision here that none of this appropriation shall be spent in Utah? I am perfectly willing to vote for such a provision, as the Senator does not seem to want the appropriation for his State, and I think the chairman of the committee will accept such an amendment. The Senator says it is a useless waste of money. There are other sections of the country where we think these maps, if the appropriation is made, will be of great benefit.

Mr. RAWLINS. I am speaking as to the general subject. I am not speaking against South Carolina, and I am not speaking against Utah. I have not been here very long, but—

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I think he has proved his case in regard to alkali lands; and I think we ought to strike out everything in regard to the mapping of alkali soils.

Mr. RAWLINS. I have no objection to that, but we are dealing with a question of vital importance. This is not a mere local question. I have said, and I repeat it, that I will vote for any proposition that I believe will be of worth and of practical and general usefulness to the farmers or to any other interest in this country.

But I wanted to invite attention to this question of mapping. They have mapped 200 square miles in my State, but that is but the beginning of the work; that map is of no utility unless they take other steps. After they make a general map, then they proceed with this work as to the investigation of soils, to ascertain the ingredients of the soils in every particular portion of the lands thus covered by that map. They propose then, if the lands are not fit for agriculture by reason of being impregnated with minerals, to make a survey so as to ascertain how the minerals may be drained from the land by digging channels. I suppose they will proceed next to make a survey for the benefit of the landowners as to the line of direction in which these channels should be dug. After they have proceeded thus far in the way of paternalism, in taking care of the farmers, I do not see any reason why we should not make an appropriation for digging the channels and furnishing the pipe by which to carry off the water. It seems to me that this is the initiatory step in what may result in a tremendous undertaking and in very extensive appropriations.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the appropriation for a ship subsidy; I am opposed to making appropriations for the improvement of any creek that can not be rendered fit for navigation. I will vote with the Senator from South Carolina in the direction of economy; and I will vote with the Senator from Maine in the direction of any expenditure which will be for the public benefit and within the range of the objects for which the taxes of the country may be employed; but whether this thing happens to fall

either in my State or in any other State, if I do not deem it a matter to which the taxes wrung from the people should be applied I shall vote against it.

I shall vote for the proposition submitted by the Senator from Colorado, and also, if the Senator from Maine will make a proposition to restrict the application of these moneys to legitimate purposes, I shall vote in favor of his proposition.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am not sensitive as to the lobster argument which has been introduced into this debate. The Senators who have relieved the ordinary tedium of their remarks by making game of my little lobster bill are entirely welcome to all the fun they can have out of it. It is not little appropriations, which are distinct in their nature and limited to a few thousand dollars, that are dangerous. They come and they go, and that is the end of them, like the little lobster bill which was passed, and things of that kind. I am very glad I succeeded in getting it passed, and I am not sensitive about it in the least.

I have, I think, an amendment here which will help this mapping business very much. If, instead of the language commencing in line 6, on page 33, which certainly is very comprehensive and unmeasured, "to map the tobacco soils of the United States," we put in "For investigations of the soils of the United States by indicating upon maps or plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations," we would know something about what the Department is doing in this direction and we would not commit ourselves to the enterprise of making new maps; but we take such maps as we have of communities and indicate upon them, by coloring or by any other process, what the Department has done, and from time to time we can control that work.

I shall also move to strike out, in lines 15 and 16, on page 30, the words:

To investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

We certainly are not called upon to extend our researches there at present, and if the Department is busy in a limited way in the United States it can await future developments in regard to the rest of the world. I think by the adoption of the amendments I have suggested we shall get this provision into pretty good shape, so that it will not be open to the objections which some of us have raised, that it is a measure in the line of great extravagance which will come back in the future to trouble us.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I would direct the attention of the Senator to page 30, line 16, in the House bill, which has been stricken out, or rather, which has been copied into the Senate amendment with some omissions. There the words are:

To map the tobacco soils of the United States: to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

That applies to the tobacco industry only, and as copied in drawing up the Senate amendment, leaving out the word "tobacco," which has been reinserted, the amendment as now amended would apply to the original purpose of investigating the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

If the Senator will give me his attention, I wish to remind him that tobacco is a product of Cuba and Sumatra, with which the Southern tobacco growers are trying to compete. I happen to know from observation that the Cuban tobacco has leaves possibly not more than one-third the size of the South Carolina tobacco. Anything which will enable the tobacco growers of our State and other States engaged in that industry to grow tobacco which will run the Cuban and Sumatra tobacco out of our market is a perfectly legitimate matter for investigation by the Agricultural Department. I do not think the Senator, if he will consider for a moment, will object to leaving those words in and allowing the Agricultural Department to continue to assist the tobacco growers of the United States with such special information as can be derived from the investigation of the soils and conditions of the growth of tobacco by those competitors of ours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is permitted to decide the point of order, then the amendment may be better discussed. The discussion has drifted far away from the real question. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has made the point of order that this is new legislation, in violation of Rule XVI, inasmuch as it makes an appropriation for a purpose for which there is no existing law.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought the Senator from Maine had withdrawn the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true; but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] renewed the point of order. The Chair would ordinarily submit such a question to the Senate, as the present occupant of the chair is here only by the courtesy of the permanent presiding officer; but it seems to the Chair so clear that the amendment is but a modification of the existing law that the Chair will hold the point of order is not well taken. The question now before the Senate—

Mr. TELLER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless the Senator from Colorado desires to submit the point of order to the Senate—

Mr. TELLER. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question, then, before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee proposing to strike out certain words, which have been read to the Senate for its information.

Mr. HALE. Let the amendment be again read.

Mr. TELLER. I will, for the time being, in order that the amendments now pending may be disposed of, withdraw that, and may, perhaps, renew it later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who offered the amendment has a right under the rules to withdraw it.

Mr. TELLER. If, however, the clause is amended satisfactorily, I may not renew my amendment.

Mr. HALE. Then I move to insert the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 6, after the word "district," it is proposed to strike out the words:

To map the soils of the United States.

And to insert:

For investigations of soils in the United States and for indicating upon maps or plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations.

Mr. PROCTOR. On behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I will accept that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator allow me a moment, simply in the line of the amendment which I have offered, to move to amend in one or two other places so as to conform to the amendments already made?

Mr. BUTLER. As to this part of the committee amendment?

Mr. HALE. Yes; as a part of the same amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I will yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. HALE. In line 9, page 33, I move to strike out the word "mapped" and insert "indicated upon maps or plats, as above provided."

Mr. PROCTOR. The committee is willing to accept that amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I move, also, in line 10—

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the chairman of the committee as to the modification which the Senator from Maine has presented, to which I agree, that he might strike out all of that which the Senator from Colorado proposes, because you will find it very difficult to follow that amendment by changing or modifying the language all the way through without having a very involved and, I might say, contorted sentence.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. HALE. I think we do not find that language afterwards at all. These words follow: "till the same percentage of soil mapping shall have been accomplished in other States and Territories." As to that, I shall have a suggestion to make.

Mr. MALLORY. I should like to hear the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let it be read as it will stand if amended.

Mr. HALE. In line 10, on page 33, I move to strike out the words "soil mapping."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 10, on page 33, it is proposed to strike out the words "soil mapping" and insert "indicated upon maps or plats."

Mr. HALE. Oh, no; that amendment goes out. The words "soil mapping" are in line 10. Instead of those two words I move to insert the words "such work." That refers to what we have just provided for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 10, after the words "percentage of," it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out "soil mapping" and inserting "such work."

Mr. PROCTOR. Now, let the Secretary read the committee amendment in lines 8, 9, and 10 as proposed to be amended.

Mr. HALE. That is right.

The Secretary read as follows:

Provided, That when 50 per cent of the arable soil of any State or Territory in which the work has been done shall have been indicated upon maps or plats as above provided, no further work is to be done in that State or Territory till the same percentage of such work shall have been accomplished in the other States and Territories of the United States.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is right.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MALLORY. What is the amendment in line 6?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment referred to.

The SECRETARY. In line 6, after the word "districts," strike out the words "to map the soils of the United States" and insert:

For investigations of soils in the United States and for indicating upon maps or plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will probably improve the committee amendment, or it will certainly remove some of the dangerous and evil results that he thought might follow and which I think might follow. But still I want to call attention to the fact that this is to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate a specific soil for a specific kind of plant and to carry out that investigation to its completion, as he will in the case of tobacco. We have now restricted the Secretary of Agriculture to the special investigation as to tobacco.

In his letter, which was read here this morning, he took the position which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] took yesterday. That was the position I tried to express—that he ought to have the power to make special investigations; and he went on in that letter to enumerate them, in addition to tobacco, beet sugar and half a dozen other special investigations that he thought would be of great benefit to the farmers and to the country generally. In fact, the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture was not for this general scheme, as it was read at the desk, but was for this specific work.

Now, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that with this amendment as he has amended it the Secretary of Agriculture will get half through the soil of a State and he will have to pick up and go over into another geographical territory, where he will strike, probably, a different kind of soil, adapted to an entirely different kind of growth, and not connected with the investigation he is making. Instead of facilitating the special information and making it complete on one subject, it seems to me this language will hamper him; and, as the Senator from Maine so well said this morning, it seems as if it had been drawn by some specialist or theorist in the Department, and not by the Secretary himself; that this specialist had one idea and the Secretary had probably another. As another Senator said, it also smells more of patronage and place than it does of helping the farmer. It means a great additional horde of employees.

I protest against the kind of discussion we have had from some Senators this morning—I do not mean to be offensive when I say it—in standing up and posing as champions of the farmers of the country and in claiming that any man who was not for this provision as it stands was against the interest of the farmers. I have no objection to the advocacy by Senators of the cause of the farmer. We will all indorse that, but Senators who discuss this provision should not charge that everybody who criticises it is against the interest of the farmer. I submit that that is not a fair way to treat this question; that it was not proper that Senators should take such a position when there was nothing to call for it.

My only objection to this language is that I think it will not accomplish the best results for agriculture. Nobody is opposing the \$91,000 appropriation. I am ready to vote for twice that amount if it be necessary. If the Secretary of Agriculture had asked us to put in specific appropriations here for tobacco or for beets or the other items named in his letter which was read this morning; if he had figured up \$200,000 as the amount necessary for doing it, I take it that it would have been voted by the Senate without five minutes' discussion, and I do not believe a single Senator here would have voted against it. It is purely a question of what will be the effect of this amendment, whether or not it will advance the cause of agriculture.

I think the criticism by some Senators that those who wanted to change the language and to amend it were not willing to give a pittance to the farmer was uncalled for. It was gratuitous; and surely, while it might read well to their constituents down home when seen apart from the context of what others had said, there was no occasion for such criticism here or of any attempt to make such an impression on the people of the country.

I appreciate the work that the Department of Agriculture is doing. I do not suppose there is a Senator in this body who has read more of the pamphlets gotten out by the Agricultural Department on soils, on fertilizers, on milk, and on all of the important questions discussed in the 121 farmers' bulletins that have been issued, or a Senator who has distributed more of those bulletins than I have. I have made it my business, knowing their value, to call the attention of the farmers of my State to the fact of their existence by publishing letters in the newspapers, so as to create a demand for those bulletins and let the people know they were here and that they could get them and read them. I have called attention to the valuable practical information contained in them. I appreciate the work the Department is doing, and I wish every farmer in the United States could read the 121 farmers' bulletins which they now have for free distribution, covering almost every question relating to agriculture, and there is not one of them that it will not pay every farmer in the United States to read.

But, Mr. President, this provision looks to me as if it were simply to get an army of officeholders to go tramping over the country and logrolling from one State to another, so that we will have one-half of this work done in one State and half in another, and another State can have no further investigations until every other State has got its half; and applications will be made as to millions of acres of land that do need to be plotted or investigated.

The only sense I can see in this is making a specific investigation of the soil for a specific purpose, for some specific crop, like tobacco, and the other special objects named by the Secretary. I think language ought to be employed to authorize him to do that. I do not think he ought to be authorized to go to making investigations of every inch of the soil of the United States. They would be perfectly worthless when the work had been done, except for certain specific purposes, and it would be a needless expense.

Mr. President, I call attention to this phase of the subject in the way I look at it. I do not know that the members of the committee and the Senators who have discussed it are satisfied with the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine. I do not know that I will offer any further amendment; but still I think it is a very unnecessary, cumbersome, and troublesome provision when you require the work to be tied down, doing 50 per cent in each State, and then stopping the investigation. If the investigation of soils is to be carried on for a time and then the work stopped and the investigators are to go to another State, there is no sense in it; it is perfectly absurd. Besides, I do not think that these investigations of soils ought to be carried on, except when we are looking for soil of a certain kind for a specific purpose. When we have done that, then we have covered the soil that should be investigated, and the knowledge gained would be of some value after the investigation.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there should be an amendment in line 16. The language now there is "to investigate the soils and conditions of growth in Cuba," etc. After the word "of" the word "tobacco" should be inserted, so as to read "to investigate the soils and conditions of tobacco growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries."

Mr. PROCTOR. Does the Senator from Maine make that motion?

Mr. HALE. Yes; I move to insert those words. Evidently, as Senators will see if they will read this clause, it all relates to tobacco and the tobacco industry, but as it is now left it provides for investigations into every kind of growth. I wish to limit it to what was undoubtedly the purpose of the clause.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is plainly the purpose of the clause, because the same words were in the bill last year, following the words "to map the tobacco soils," and so I accept the two amendments of the Senator.

Mr. HALE. Then, after the words "to investigate the soils and conditions," in lines 15 and 16 of the committee amendment, on page 33, I move to insert the word "tobacco."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee, on page 33, line 16, before the word "growth," by inserting the word "tobacco;" so as to read:

To investigate the soils and conditions of tobacco growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other competing countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PROCTOR. I accept the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I am inclined to think that the words "and other competing countries" had better be stricken out, or else that the clause should be made to read "and other tobacco competing countries."

Mr. PROCTOR. There is no objection to an amendment inserting the word "tobacco" after the word "other."

Mr. HALE. Then I move, after the word "other," in line 16, to insert the word "tobacco."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 16, after the word "other," it is proposed to insert "tobacco;" so as to read:

To investigate the soils and conditions of tobacco growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other tobacco competing countries.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I do not know what the general amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is, but I think these amendments will help the provision of the committee very considerably.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to suggest that my amendment was to strike out the proviso, commencing in line 6, on page 33:

Provided, That when 50 per cent of the arable soil of any State or Territory in which the work has been done shall have been mapped, no further work is

to be done in that State or Territory till the same percentage of soil mapping shall have been accomplished in the other States and Territories of the United States, etc.

I think all of that ought to go out and let the provision stand with the amendment made on the motion of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator is right about that.

Mr. TELLER. I move to strike out from the word "Provided," in line 6, down to and including the word "Territory," in line 15. That will leave the clause as proposed by the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 33, line 6, after the words "United States," it is proposed to strike out—

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say that I will accept that amendment; but I ask to have it withheld until we can see what the effect of the amendments already made in that clause, on the motion of the Senator from Maine, will be, so as to be sure it will be correct.

Mr. TELLER. All right; let it stand for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw the amendment?

Mr. HALE. He withholds the amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. I understood the chairman of the committee to accept the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, with the idea of altering it or changing it so as to carry out his view, and leave in what the Senator from Maine has had inserted.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that if this proviso is stricken out it will not complicate the section at all. It will leave the provisos amended on the motion of the Senator from Maine, so far as any changes were made in them, simply adapted to that amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. The whole proviso ought to go out.

Mr. SPOONER. The whole proviso from line 6 to line 15, including the word "Territory." I think all of that ought to go out.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Secretary will read, commencing on line 6, down to the end of line 16, as the clause would stand if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado be agreed to, that would be satisfactory, so that we can be sure there is no mistake being made.

The SECRETARY. Beginning on page 33, line 3, the amendment of the committee as it has been amended reads:

The investigation of the relation of soils to drainage and seepage waters, and of methods for the prevention of the accumulation of and injury from seepage waters, in irrigated districts; for investigations of soils in the United States, and for indicating upon maps or plats, by coloring or otherwise, the results of such investigations; to map the tobacco soils of the United States; to investigate the soils and conditions of tobacco growth in Cuba, Sumatra, and other tobacco-competing countries.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is all right. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. As we have perfected the provision in regard to mapping, the words which I will read, embraced in lines 7, 8, 9, and 10 of page 34, to wit:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue and extend the survey and mapping of agricultural lands, and for all necessary expenses connected with the survey—

should be stricken out, for we have provided that instead of being a survey it shall be indicating on the maps and plats.

Mr. PROCTOR. I understand we have stricken out the word "survey." The proper word should be inserted. What is the proper word?

Mr. HALE. Strike out the words "and mapping."

Mr. PROCTOR. That is all right.

Mr. HALE. In line 9, I move to strike out the words "and mapping" and inserting in lieu thereof—what?

Mr. BUTLER. Just put in "investigations."

Mr. HALE. That is it; that will cover it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Maine completed his amendment?

Mr. HALE. In line 9 I move to strike out the words "and mapping" and insert "and investigations;" and after the words "of agricultural lands" I move to insert "as hereinbefore provided."

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PROCTOR. "Investigations and indication."

Mr. HALE. "Investigations" will cover the whole thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 34, line 9, strike out the word "mapping" and insert "investigations;" and also in the same line, after the word "lands," insert "as hereinbefore provided."

Mr. HALE. That is right; that will cover it.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment to the amendment?

Mr. HALE. It is accepted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 34, after line 17, to insert:

Total for Bureau of Soils, \$109,140.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 12, after the word "purposes," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-seven;" in line 13, after the word "thousand," to insert "five hundred," and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "\$1,000 of which shall be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

General expenses of biological investigations: For biological investigations, including the geographic distribution and migrations of animals, birds, and plants; for the promotion of economic ornithology and mammalogy; for an investigation of the food habits of North American birds and mammals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; for freight and express charges; for preparation and publication of reports, and for illustrations, field work, and traveling and other expenses in the practical work of the division, and to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of an act approved May 25, 1900, entitled "An act to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibiting the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes," \$27,500, \$1,000 of which shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 16, to increase the total appropriation for Division of Biological Survey from \$32,800 to \$40,300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 22, page 38.

Mr. PROCTOR. The word "fifty-five" is a misprint. As passed by the House it was \$65,000, and I now, on behalf of the committee, move to increase the appropriation \$5,500, making it read "\$170,500," and for this reason: Last year the appropriation for bulletins was increased \$20,000, but there was no addition for their distribution, for the purchase of envelopes and the expense of distribution, so that it is practically a deficiency. The Department is not able to distribute those voted last year without this increase. When the bill was before the committee we understood that it was provided for in the general appropriation, but we found it was a mistake. So I now move the amendment.

Mr. BATE. What is the exact motion of the Senator from Vermont with respect to this clause? We had it up in committee, I remember, and there was some increase necessary, but what amount does the Senator now propose to increase it?

Mr. PROCTOR. In line 22, page 38, the printed words are an error. It should be "sixty-five."

Mr. BATE. The "fifty-five" is an error?

Mr. PROCTOR. The "fifty-five" is an error. It should be "sixty-five." My amendment proposes to increase the appropriation \$5,500, striking out the misprint "fifty-five" and inserting "seventy," which is an addition of \$5,000.

Mr. BATE. To the original amount of \$65,000?

Mr. PROCTOR. To the original amount; and then after "thousand" inserting the words "five hundred."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 38, line 23, strike out "fifty-five" and insert "seventy," and after the word "thousand," in the same line, insert "five hundred;" so as to read "one hundred and seventy thousand five hundred dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 39, line 20, after the word "year," to insert "and the remainder of said sum;" so as to read:

That all such bulletins included in the quotas of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates not called for on or before the 30th day of June in each fiscal year shall revert to the Secretary of Agriculture, and be available to him, either for miscellaneous distribution or in making up Congressional quotas for the next fiscal year, and the remainder of said sum for the pay of artists, draftsmen, and engravers, and of proof readers and indexers when necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 5, after the word "dollars," to insert "of which sum \$5,500 shall be immediately available," and in line 7, after the word "building," to insert "and for such alterations as may be needed;" so as to make the clause read:

General expenses, Division of Publications: * * * \$57,500, of which sum \$5,500 shall be immediately available; for the rent of a building and for such alterations as may be needed, not to exceed \$2,500 per annum, for the storage of publications; in all, \$167,500.

Mr. PROCTOR. The amendment already made requires a change in the total. I move in line 5 to strike out "fifty-seven"

and insert "sixty-three," and in the same line strike out the words "five hundred," which makes an addition in the total of \$5,500, the same as was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 5, strike out "fifty-seven" and insert "sixty-three," and in the same line, after "thousand," strike out "five hundred," so as to read "sixty-three thousand dollars."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. After the words "per annum," in the ninth line, page 40, I move further to amend the amendment by inserting "to be immediately available."

Mr. BATE. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill, whether the words "to be immediately available" should be inserted after the words "per annum," or after the word "publications," at the end of line 9. Do you want to confine it to the storage of publications? Would it not be better to bring it in after the word "publications?" As it is, it confines it to that point, "storage of publications."

Mr. PROCTOR. I think it can not be misconstrued where it is.

Mr. BATE. I merely suggest that the other place would be better, because as it is now it applies exclusively to the storage of publications. Otherwise it might apply to both.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is intended to apply to that alone.

Mr. BATE. Exclusively?

Mr. PROCTOR. To the rent of a building. They have needed it for more than a year. They can hire a building now, and until the end of the next fiscal year, and repair it; but they need it immediately.

Mr. TILLMAN. They need it for the storage of publications.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina must not speak from his seat.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee is perhaps a good one, and in line 9 it should read "not to exceed \$2,500 per annum, for the storage of publications, to be immediately available."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont propose the amendment?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed, in line 9, to add at the end of the line, after the word "publications," the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. PROCTOR. The other amendment, of course, is withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. The amendment already made requires a change in the total from "sixty-seven thousand" to "seventy-three thousand," and also the striking out of the words "five hundred," in line 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 10, strike out the words "fifty-seven" and insert "seventy-three;" and after the word "thousand" strike out "five hundred;" so as to read:

In all, \$173,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 13 on page 40.

Mr. PROCTOR. In order to make the total agree, I move to strike out, in line 13, the word "two" and insert "eight," and also strike out "five hundred" after the word "thousand."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 40, line 13, strike out "two" and insert "eight," and in the same line, after the word "thousand," strike out the words "five hundred;" so as to read:

Total for Division of Publications, \$198,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 24, on page 40.

Mr. CAFFERY. At this point I have an amendment to offer. It is an amendment to strike out all after line 25—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will pause a moment. There was a consent agreement that the committee amendments should be first acted upon. That has been departed from, but the Chair considers it still the law of this case, and the amendment proposed would not be in order for the present.

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to ask the Senator from Vermont whether or not in the administration of the Department any other than the cereal crops and cotton are included in the monthly or

annual reports of the condition and growth during the year? Do reports of the Secretary of Agriculture comprehend such crops as tobacco, sugar, rice, fruits, and so on, or are they limited to cotton and the cereals?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not understand that they are limited. I know, in fact, that reports are made on crops in general in my country.

Mr. CAFFERY. So far as I am informed, and I have been informed by the chief of this division, as you call it, there are no reports on tobacco, rice, sugar, and fruits, and I will say to the Senator that I have an amendment, prepared by the Statistician of the Agricultural Department, which looks toward striking out all after line 25, on page 40, down to the end of line 2, on page 42, and substituting other provisions instead of those contained on those pages.

Mr. PROCTOR. Perhaps a letter which I have from the Secretary will settle this point. He says:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1901.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In my estimates for the pending Agricultural appropriation bill I wanted \$25,000 to enable the Statistician to enlarge the scope of his work by including new farm products, such as rice, sugar, fruit, flax, tobacco, etc., on the basis of the new census. The House committee agreed to this, among other things, but points of order required them to go back to the estimates of a year ago. After consultation with the Statistician on this point, I conclude that we will try to get along with \$15,000, \$10,000 of which would be necessary for use in the city of Washington in compiling the increased number of returns, and \$5,000 for getting these returns from the fields. Please have this inserted for me, as we want, by all means, to take advantage of the new facts given in the new census.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

Hon. REDFIELD PROCTOR,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators will allow the Chair to suggest that the Senate had better carry out the order heretofore made, and go on with the consideration of the committee amendments.

Mr. CAFFERY. I will ask the Chair whether I can not discuss, while I have risen, any matters pertinent to the bill, whether it refers to an amendment or otherwise?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I propose, when we reach the proper point, to move a committee amendment increasing this appropriation \$15,000 for the purposes named in the Secretary's letter.

Mr. CAFFERY. When the point is reached for outside amendments I will attempt to get in the amendment of which I have spoken. I think a bureau is as necessary in this division as it is in any other division.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CAFFERY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BATE. I wish to say a word as to the ruling of the Chair in regard to amendments. I do not think the agreement extends to the point of depriving a Senator of the right to introduce an amendment. The Senator from Louisiana does not propose that the amendment shall be considered now, as I understand it, but he merely wishes to introduce it for action hereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At any time when they can get the floor, according to the practice of the Senate, Senators may submit amendments.

Mr. BATE. That is what the Senator is after now.

Mr. CAFFERY. While I am on the floor I will call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that this very important branch of the Department, collating all facts relating to various crops, is not organized under the form of a bureau. There are the Bureau of Soils, the Bureau of Chemistry, the Bureau of Forestry, and various other bureaus, and this very important, perhaps the most important, branch of the work of the Agricultural Department is now under the organization of a division.

It occurs to me that there ought to be a bureau with more extensive clerical service and a larger appropriation than that indicated by the Senator from Vermont in order to carry into execution the work with which it is charged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will please excuse the Chair, but there is now no question before the Senate, and we could get along much better if we would go on with the regular business.

Mr. CAFFERY. I will ask the Chair a parliamentary question. I do not know much about parliamentary proceedings, but the question is, Whether a Senator, when he is on the floor, can not address the Senate upon any subject that he desires and whether he is to be limited in his remarks to the question in hand? I have heard all sorts of foreign matters debated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been the practice here, and possibly it may be the rule, but it is sometimes marvelously indulged in.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. I have much sympathy with his view about this division and raised that point with the Secretary, and he said that he was in favor of it at an early day, but for some reasons in regard to organization he could not properly formulate and recommend it at this time. I think there is no question but that it will be brought about in another year. I fully agree with the views of the Senator that it is of importance enough to be made a bureau and perhaps more duties may be devolved upon it. But it is a matter which requires time and careful consideration in preparing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana, if he chooses, can proceed under this universal construction.

Mr. CAFFERY. I thought, Mr. President, it might expedite matters to discuss now the bearing of the amendment which I have notified the Senator from Vermont I shall offer, but I rather think it will be more appropriate and perhaps in better taste to defer the discussion until after all the committee amendments shall have been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is obliged to the Senator from Louisiana.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and continued to page 41, line 25.

Mr. PROCTOR. From the committee I move an amendment in line 22 to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-five," and in line 23 to strike out "sixty" and insert "seventy." That is in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary in the letter which I read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 41, line 22, strike out the word "ten," at the end of the line before "thousand," and insert "twenty-five," and in line 23, same page, strike out the word "sixty" before "thousand" and insert "seventy," so as to read:

That \$15,000 of the amount hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, may be expended in continuing the investigations concerning the feasibility of extending the demands of foreign markets for the agricultural products of the United States, and to secure, as far as may be, a change in the methods of supplying farm products to foreign countries, \$125,000, of which sum not more than \$70,000 shall be expended for salaries in the city of Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 42, line 2.

Mr. PROCTOR. In lines 1 and 2 the total should be changed to correspond with the previous amendment. Before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "forty-six" and insert "sixty-one;" so as to read:

Total for Division of Statistics, \$161,100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 42, line 16, to increase the appropriation for purchase of technical books of reference, technical papers, etc., for Agricultural Department library, from \$5,000 to \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 18, to increase the total appropriation for library, Department of Agriculture, from \$14,000 to \$16,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 3, to increase the appropriation for nutrition investigations, Department of Agriculture, from \$17,000 to \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 16, to increase the appropriation for irrigation investigations, Department of Agriculture, from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 25, after the word "experiments," to insert "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the chemical and physical character of road materials, for the pay of experts, chemists, and laborers, for necessary apparatus and materials," and on page 48, line 8, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-seven;" in the same line, after the word "thousand," to insert "five hundred," and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

Public road inquiries: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make inquiries in regard to the system of road management throughout the United States; to make investigations in regard to the best methods of road making, and the best kind of road-making materials in the several States; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in conducting experiments in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and in collating, digesting, reporting, and illustrating the results of such experiments; to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the chemical and physical character of road materials, for the pay of experts, chemists, and laborers, for necessary apparatus and materials; traveling, and other necessary expenses, and for preparing and publishing bulletins and reports on this subject for distribution, and to enable him to assist the agricultural

colleges and experiment stations in disseminating information on this subject, \$27,500, of which sum \$5,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 22, after the word "dollars," to insert "\$2,000 of which shall be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

Tea culture: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and report on the cost of making tea and the best method of cultivating and preparing the same for market, so as to demonstrate whether it is practicable to introduce its culture in the Southern States as a profitable industry, \$7,000, \$2,000 of which shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 12, to insert:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend for labor in the city of Washington during the present fiscal year, out of the sum appropriated for seeds for 1901, a total amount not exceeding \$33,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 52, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to have prepared, under his direction, plans for a fireproof administrative building, to be erected on the grounds of the Department of Agriculture, in the city of Washington, said plans, and such recommendations thereon as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, to be transmitted to Congress at its next regular session, \$5,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. CAFFERY. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Vermont what is meant by an "administrative building" in the amendment. I do not exactly understand what that means.

Mr. MONEY. If the Senator will allow me, I offered that amendment, and it was adopted by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi ought to address the Chair.

Mr. MONEY. I beg the Chair's pardon, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. CAFFERY. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. By permission of the chairman of the committee, I am replying to the inquiry of the Senator from Louisiana. I introduced this amendment, and had it referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It was unanimously reported favorably, and then adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The design is, as it states here, that the Secretary may be enabled by the next meeting of Congress to present designs, specifications, drawings, etc., for an administrative building. It means a building to contain the whole Department of Agriculture, which now rents a great mass of small buildings. It has a lot of wooden barns scattered over the grounds, all liable to destruction in about a minute by fire, very uncomfortable, absolutely insufferable in hot weather, with no modern conveniences of any kind whatever. It is intended to have a building that will be commensurate with the dignity of the Department of Agriculture and the great interest which it represents, like the other administrative buildings, and be an ornament to the city of Washington. Congress at the next session will consider these plans.

I wish to say for the benefit of the Senator and others interested that the building which is now occupied by the Secretary has already been condemned as unsafe. When you drop a book in the library it shakes the building. So I have been told by the officers in the rooms below, the chief clerk and others. It has no elevator in it, although it is four stories high. All the conveniences which belong to modern buildings are entirely absent or of such character as would be a disgrace to a country schoolhouse. There is nothing there that befits the character or the dignity of a department of any kind. I am quite sure the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that it is a proper measure.

Mr. CAFFERY. I agree perfectly with the Senator from Mississippi as to the necessity of having a new building for the Agricultural Department. I am thoroughly in favor of this amendment appropriating \$5,000 for a design for a new building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 52, after line 8, to insert:

That section 2 of the act approved March 3, 1885, chapter 338, Forty-eighth Congress, second session, imposing restrictions and duties upon the Department of Agriculture not imposed upon the other Executive Departments, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

Mr. PROCTOR. I offer an amendment to follow at the close of what has just been read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is one of the committee amendments?

Mr. PROCTOR. It is a committee amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has the last amendment of the committee been adopted, the last clause in the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last amendment was adopted without objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I rose to speak before I heard the Chair declare that it was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then that ruling will be revoked and the Chair will hear the Senator.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire to wait until he hears the amendment which I have proposed. It has a bearing on the amendment which appears in the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it an amendment to the last clause?

Mr. PROCTOR. It is, particularly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then if it is an amendment to the last clause, I will wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire rose to correct the Chair. The Senator from Vermont has the floor. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add to the last amendment, on page 52:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is directed, so far as practicable and consistent with economy and efficient administration, to submit in the estimates for that Department for the year 1903 provisions for placing the force of his Department upon the statutory roll.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will inquire again whether the six-line amendment has been adopted or whether we are only considering the amendment of the Senator from Vermont?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment which appears in the bill, including line 9 to the end, has not been adopted. It was so declared by the Chair, but the Chair revoked the ruling.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I desire to speak to the new amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. CHANDLER. The provision which it is proposed to repeal, section 2 of the act of March 3, 1885, provides:

That no part of the money herein or hereafter appropriated for the Department of Agriculture shall be paid to any person, as additional salary or compensation, receiving at the same time other compensation as an officer or employee of the Government.

Mr. President, I am not certain that I am opposed to the repeal of that clause, and yet I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that we are particular in legislation to provide that persons receiving regular salaries—fixed salaries—from the Government shall not have their compensation increased by the head of the Department, who might see fit to spend appropriations given to the Department for its use by increasing the compensation of these regular salaried employees. Now, that is the provision which it is proposed to repeal. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to this proposition. What I ask is whether it is intended that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have the discretion to use portions of the appropriations contained in this bill to increase the salary of regular salaried employees of his Department? If so, ought we to legislate in that direction?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, there were two reasons, perhaps, for the adoption of this provision of the general statute. There was a case—a glaring one—of an officer, not now living, receiving double salaries, and it was passed to hit that particular case. There has been no complaint since then, and I do not believe there is any danger of it. I ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to listen to my statement.

The difficulty the Secretary labors under is that he finds it necessary sometimes to get special service from experts and scientists in all parts of the country; just some single special service; and he is oftentimes embarrassed. He has now to go to work to find whether the man is receiving any Government salary; and he is frequently prohibited from getting the temporary and special service by reason of this act.

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator a question? The amendment which the Senator proposes recites—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire should address the Chair.

Mr. CHANDLER. With the utmost respect, Mr. President, I address the Chair and ask leave to interrupt the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. CHANDLER. What I intended to ask the Senator is whether he is entirely sure of the correctness of the statement that the restrictions and duties imposed upon the Department of Agriculture by the act of March 3, 1885, are not imposed upon the other Executive Departments of the Government? The amendment recites that proposition. Now, is that certainly correct?

Mr. PROCTOR. I have only the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. I did not investigate it.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to answer the Senator from New Hampshire?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

Mr. MONEY. I think the statute will show that fact, if the Senator from New Hampshire will give me his attention.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. MONEY. I was just saying that the statute will show it to be the fact that only the Department of Agriculture has this restriction; and I will state that it was on account, as the Senator from Vermont said a while ago, of a gentleman who was drawing salaries from two or three different sources, but only one from that Department. The case was such a glaring one that this restriction was put upon that Department, he being an officer of the Department regularly carried on the statutory roll. He was a very brilliant man; his services were in requisition; he was a great entomologist, and had a national and a world-wide reputation. He got a great many different salaries, and the law was passed to prevent that. The man is dead.

The trouble right now may be, perhaps, summed up in one word. There is a very distinguished man there, who is a retired Army officer, and it would be pretty hard upon him if he had to remain idle upon his retired pay. He has a position there. He fills it with great ability, and the question has been raised whether he is eligible under this restrictive act, which does not apply to any other Department of the Government. I think surely the restriction ought to go out of the statutes without any objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Iowa suggests that I ask to have the clause amended by inserting, after the word "That," in line 9, the words "so much of;" and in line 11 changing the word "imposing" to the words "as imposes;" so as to read:

That so much of section 2 of the act approved March 3, 1885, chapter 338, Forty-eighth Congress, second session, as imposes restrictions and duties upon the Department of Agriculture not imposed upon the other Executive Departments be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

That would put all the Departments upon the same footing. I will make that motion.

Mr. PROCTOR. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will please report the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, line 9, after the word "That," it is proposed to insert "so much of;" and in line 11, after the word "session," to strike out "imposing" and insert "as imposes;" so as to read:

That so much of section 2 of the act approved March 3, 1885, chapter 338, Forty-eighth Congress, second session, as imposes restrictions and duties upon the Department of Agriculture not imposed upon the other Executive Departments be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on page 52, beginning in line 9, as it has been amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from California will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, in line 17, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

Point Reyes, California, \$3,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I desire to state that Point Reyes is a cape or promontory running out into the sea, 35 miles north of San Francisco. It is connected by telegraph and telephone wires with San Francisco. It is of great value as a point of observation for the Weather Bureau, as the cycles of storms coming down from the north are first observed at that place. A Weather Bureau station has been established there for many years. It has proved of great value, not only to the commercial interests of San Francisco, but to the agricultural and horticultural interests of our State. The weather observer has been occupying by sufferance a part of the building belonging to the Light-House Department, there being upon this point a light-house, a fog-signal station, and the keeper's home; but the Agricultural Department has been notified within the past two days that by reason of increasing the force in the light-house they can no longer accommodate the observer for the Weather Bureau. It is, therefore, most important that this appropriation be made for the purpose of building a house for the Weather Bureau observer to live in. I

trust, with this statement, that the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. PROCTOR. The committee accept the amendment. The proposition was laid before the committee, and we recognized the necessity of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. The adoption of the amendment makes a change of totals necessary, and I suggest that it be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "\$45,320" and to insert "\$48,320."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, to come in on page 13, at the end of line 6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 13, at the end of line 6, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the Secretary of Agriculture may construe the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, as amended March 2, 1895, for the inspection of live cattle and products thereof, to include dairy products intended for exportation to any foreign country; may apply, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, the provisions of the said act for inspection and certification appropriate for ascertaining the purity and quality of such products; and may cause the same to be so marked, stamped, or labeled as to secure their identity and make known in the markets of foreign countries to which they may be sent from the United States their purity, quality, and grade; and all the provisions of said act relating to live stock and products thereof for export shall apply to dairy products so exported and certified.

Mr. TILLMAN. In a long amendment of that character it is very difficult for us to catch just what it means; and I submit that we had better have it read again to see if we can understand it; or possibly we may have to have it printed and defer action on the bill until we can examine it more critically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The Secretary again read the amendment proposed by Mr. DOLLIVER.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I will say that that amendment interprets the present law with respect to live cattle and meat products so as to include the products of the dairy. It has been three times recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture. It was carefully considered and reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, and was struck out of the bill in the House on a point of order. The Secretary of Agriculture very specially desires that it shall be included in this bill. I send to the desk his letter on that subject, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1901.

SIR: The proviso attached to the section for the Bureau of Animal Industry in the Department bill as reported to the House of Representatives (p. 13, H. R. 13801), allowing a broader interpretation of the act for inspection of animal products exported, and which was ruled out upon a point of order in the House, seems to have been forgotten in the Senate revision of the bill.

I should like to have this paragraph restored to the bill, as it is much needed to assist in giving permanence and character to our growing foreign trade in dairy products. The subject is fully explained in my last two or three annual reports, which have recommended this legislation.

This proposition has no bearing whatever upon oleomargarine or filled cheese. The export of these commodities is fully provided for by existing law. What is now asked, without any added expense, is simply for the purpose of improving our foreign markets for pure dairy products.

Respectfully,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

Hon. REDFIELD PROCTOR,
Chairman of Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do.

Mr. MONEY. If I understood the reading of the letter correctly, this amendment does not interfere with the oleomargarine law in any way?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Not at all. This simply aids the Secretary of Agriculture to extend the exportation of dairy products. The exportation of cheap, worthless articles, which have not been inspected, has in a large measure broken down our market for butter and cheese; and the Secretary thinks, and has so reported, that a proper inspection here would open and secure the foreign market to our dairy products.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think that is the kind of legislation we want to put on here just as we are about to pass this bill. The committee has not passed upon it. There was a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee, but the chairman of the committee did not bring it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me a moment, it did not come to the attention of the committee until after the bill had been reported to the Senate. I think I am safe in saying if it had

come to our attention earlier, the amendment would have been recommended by the committee. I certainly believe it is a wise and proper provision.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, that letter of the Secretary of Agriculture says that there is already a law regulating the examination and exportation of oleomargarine, filled cheese, etc. We have not time to examine that law, and we have not now time to examine the law that this amendment proposes to construe. It is not a construction; it is adding to; it is enacting; it is legislation. You can not construe language referring to one subject as meaning to refer to another, except by amending it; and that is what this does.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator excuse me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONEY. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that it is impossible to understand exactly the scope of this amendment from the mere reading at the desk, and I suggest that the whole amendment be printed and go over until to-morrow, so that Senators may have an opportunity of examining it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have indulged the hope that the bill would be disposed of this evening.

Mr. MONEY. I hoped so, too, but nobody understands the statute to which the Senator's amendment refers, and we can not consider the amendment until we have had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If the Senator will permit me, I will ask the Secretary to read from the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1900 his recommendations in reference to this matter, which have been many times repeated.

The Secretary read as follows:

INSPECTION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS.

It is considered extremely desirable that the existing system of Government inspection and certification of meats and meat products for exports be extended, by additional legislation, so as to include butter, cheese, and condensed milk and cream for export from the United States. Reasons for such legislation have been stated in previous reports, and they apply now even more forcefully than when first given. Briefly, a few of the arguments for such new legislation are as follows:

Foreign buyers of dairy products have so often been deceived by misleading and sometimes false statements, claiming that shipments of dairy products are high grade when really they are inferior, or in part inferior, that many of them suspect all products exported from this country, and avoid them whenever it is possible to supply their needs elsewhere. In this way we have recently lost a fine market in Great Britain for our cheese.

The Department has expended much labor and money to establish a reputation abroad for American dairy products, and already the good results accomplished are being counteracted by the shipment of inferior goods which are claimed to be of high quality. After the buyers on the other side have been defrauded a few times by such shipments they will be unwilling to deal with us when it can be avoided.

Other countries have developed large foreign trade in their dairy products, and it is well known that one of the principal reasons for their rapid advance in the largest markets of the world is the fact that their best products are marked with a government stamp, showing conclusively that the article is as represented.

The proposition of inspecting dairy products for export has been indorsed by nearly all of the large conventions of representative dairymen in this country, and it has the decided approval of commercial bodies and individual exporters. So far as I am aware, no objection to it has been made.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this matter is too important to go into the bill in this way. If the Senator offering the amendment insists on its being acted on this evening, I shall make the point of order against it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the Senator's point of order?

Mr. BUTLER. That it is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] makes the point of order that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is out of order in that it is new legislation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I understood my friend from North Carolina to state that if the amendment could be laid over and printed he would not make the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. If the amendment can be printed and go over until to-morrow, so as to give some time for an investigation of it, I may not make the point of order, but I do not say that I will not do so. But I shall surely feel constrained to insist upon the point of order if we are obliged to consider the amendment now, without any opportunity for investigation. I do not promise the Senator at all that I will not make the point of order in the morning, after I have made the examination.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I scarcely think there is difference enough between the proposed legislation and that which is already on the statute books on this matter to make the amendment subject to the point of order, and I should very much like to see the point of order withdrawn.

I am one of those who do not believe in some of the legislation that has been proposed here in the alleged interest of dairymen. I do not believe in some of the stringent provisions which some Senators think should be included in the so-called oleomargarine bill. I do think that oleomargarine should be subjected to inspection, that it should be duly branded, and that it should be handled upon its merits. I do believe that our dairy products should receive all the fostering care and fatherly care, if you choose to put it in that way, that the Agricultural Department can give to it. Those products should enjoy the same privileges as live stock and meats.

I see nothing of danger in the proposition; I see nothing but what is good in it. I do not think the amendment is subject to the point of order, when it is considered in relation to the legislation we have already enacted. It simply makes plainer, more direct, and less obscure existing legislation on this subject.

Mr. BUTLER. It is true, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] has said, that the amendment is intended to construe existing law, and the Senator worded it in that way, so as to try to get around the point of order. That, however, does not affect the question of the amendment being out of order. It is the same as if it were to amend existing law by adding anything to it, and therefore it is new legislation on this appropriation bill.

Mr. CHILTON. I want to say a word about the point of order. It seems to me that the proposed amendment is clearly general legislation. If the old statute means what the present amendment proposes, the present amendment is clearly not necessary; and if it is necessary to amend the old statute by defining it, or construing it, or whatever term you may use, it is nothing short of general legislation. It is nothing more nor less than an amendment of the existing statute. The fact that you simply describe it in the amendment as construing a law already on the statute book does not at all affect the essence of the amendment. It is an attempt to put on the statute book a certain statute in regard to the exportation of dairy products. That is what it is.

The amendment is manifestly general legislation, and the whole policy of the rule which protects appropriation bills from this sort of tinkering, it seems to me, would be nullified by just such amendments as the one proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. I can amend anything. I might offer any amendment and say that it is to construe a statute already on the statute book, and in that way amend the statute. As I said before, the substance of this proposition is to amend the existing statute in regard to the exportation of products of the United States. The effort is simply to make dairy products subject to that statute, whereas now meat products are subject to it and dairy products are not subject to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order is well taken; but being an inexperienced presiding officer, if it is requested, the Chair will submit the question to the Senate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I make that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit to the Senate the question as to whether the point of order made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BUTLER] shall be sustained. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "ayes" have it.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. I suggest to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD] that we transfer our pairs.

Mr. HEITFELD. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. Under that arrangement I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. HARRIS] that we transfer our pairs so that the Senator from Washington [Mr. TURNER] will stand paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Kansas and I will be at liberty to vote.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCBRIDE].

Mr. PRITCHARD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MC LAURIN]; but inasmuch as this is not a party question, I feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McMILLAN (after having voted in the negative). I am

paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. RAWLINS. I am paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA]. I do not see him present. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 36; as follows:

YEAS—20.			
Bate,	Chilton,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,
Berry,	Clay,	McEnery,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Culberson,	Mallory,	Teller,
Caffery,	Daniel,	Martin,	Turley,
Carter,	Heitfeld,	Pettigrew,	Vest.
NAYS—36.			
Allison,	Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Proctor,
Bard,	Foraker,	McComas,	Quarles,
Burrows,	Foster,	McCumber,	Scott,
Chandler,	Gallinger,	Mason,	Sewell,
Cullom,	Hansbrough,	Nelson,	Simon,
Deboe,	Harris,	Penrose,	Spooner,
Dillingham,	Hoar,	Perkins,	Stewart,
Dolliver,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.	Warren,
Elkins,	Kyle,	Pritchard,	Wetmore.
NOT VOTING—32.			
Aldrich,	Depew,	Lindsay,	Rawlins,
Allen,	Frye,	McBride,	Shoup,
Bacon,	Hale,	McLaurin,	Sullivan,
Baker,	Hanna,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Beveridge,	Hawley,	Money,	Tillman,
Clapp,	Jones, Nev.	Morgan,	Turner,
Clark,	Kearns,	Platt, N. Y.	Wellington,
Cockrell,	Kenney,	Quay,	Wolcott.

So the amendment of Mr. DOLLIVER was declared to be in order.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the bill, but I wish to say that as the matter seemed when the point of order was presented, I think the decision of the Chair was entirely correct, and I should have voted to sustain the decision of the Chair. But after the decision my attention was called, as was that of some other Senators, to this clause in the bill:

And the Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other farm products of the United States, and for the suitable transportation of the same.

It seemed to me that it was competent for the Senate, because of this subject-matter being in the bill, to provide for its inspection as one of the lines for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy products. I want to say this in justice to the Chair. The Chair's attention was not called by any Senator to this provision in the bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. I was about to refer to the same matter. I wish to state that if this had the remotest relation to oleomargarine I should have opposed its being put in the bill, as I have, as a member of the committee, constantly opposed attaching to this bill any amendment touching that subject in the least.

Now, in regard to the need of this amendment, it is well known that we have suffered and have lost largely our market abroad for dairy products for want of some system of inspection. Canada has largely taken away from us the foreign market for cheese, and we have suffered, too, in our market for butter. The butter of Denmark will pass the world over because it is subject to a rigid inspection, and everybody knows what it is. This is merely to carry out the provision and help our exports for genuine dairy products.

Mr. KYLE. Will the Senator allow me? In other words, it is to protect foreign citizens against imposition. Why should not the same provision be adopted for the citizens of our own country?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KYLE. We will bring up that question by and by.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to have the amendment again stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. That is rather a broader proposition than is generally supposed. The examination of dairy products should commence with the dairy farm, as the impurities almost universally come from the farm or the management of the farm. We have in another measure, the District code bill, provision for some more inspectors for the milk and cream which come to this city. There is a general consensus of opinion, I think, among those who have given the subject attention that much of the disease in all countries comes from milk where the dairy farms are not properly conducted. I do not know that it would be a proper thing to enter upon so large a subject on the pending bill; but I simply rose to call attention to the fact that the inspection of dairy products must commence with the farm if it is to do any good.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the chairman, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to examine the existing law, the two statutes which are mentioned in the amendment, and see just what the bearing of this legislation is upon those statutes and how far-reaching it is, that the amendment ought to be

printed, and that we ought to defer action on it until to-morrow. If he will consent to that, and if it is what he says it is and what the Commissioner says it is, I am certain no one on this side of the Chamber—and this appears to suddenly have become a party measure—will obstruct in the least anything which looks to giving our butter as wide a market as possible and in aiding the dairymen in obtaining such prices as will make it profitable for them to export. But, as we are changing existing law, notwithstanding a majority of the Senate says that we are not, or that the point of order is not well taken, I submit to the chairman that fairness would require that we be allowed time to examine and cooperate, if possible, with the other side of the Chamber in perfecting this bill, as we have been doing, rather than to enter into an interminable snarl as to whether oleomargarine is involved or is not.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator from Iowa has charge of this amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, if I did not indulge the hope that the pending bill would be disposed of in a few minutes, as all controverted matters have already been disposed of, I would have no objection to the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TILLMAN. I can assure the Senator that there are other amendments pending, and discussion is liable to grow up that will prevent the passage of the bill, with the regular order for a recess at half past 5. I hope he will consent to the amendment going over and being printed, so that we may know what we are doing.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The matter is very simple and I think could not be better expressed than it is by the Secretary of Agriculture in his report of 1899, to which I should like to have my friend's attention. He says:

I recommend as a simple and effective remedy for these growing evils and obstacles—

Mr. TILLMAN. What growing evils and obstacles?

Mr. DOLLIVER. He proceeds to recite them.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator would have to read the whole thing, and the Senator knows that one can not construe the effect of a change in law without examining the law. You want to examine the existing law and then you want to see what alterations are made and undertake for yourself, calmly and apart, to determine just what the result will be. Now, I submit to him, as a fair-minded man, that he is not going to get the bill through this evening in this way, and he might just as well give us on this side of the Chamber an opportunity to examine it critically for ourselves, so as to determine what it means.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I was about to read what the Secretary of Agriculture says, which would show that instead of being a matter which requires very much investigation, it is a very simple one. He says:

I recommend, as a simple and effective remedy for these growing evils and obstacles in our export trade, that the existing system of Government inspection and certification of meats and meat products for export be extended by law so as to include butter, cheese, and condensed milk and cream. With slight modifications the organized force and regulations which now give protection and standing to our meat exports may be made to cover the new work proposed.

In other words, the amendment proposes simply to extend to dairy products the provisions of the existing law as respects meat exports. It does that without increasing in the least the expenses of the Government, since it employs the same machinery; and I submit there ought not to be objection to it on either side of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I voted that this amendment was in order, and, as I understand it, I intend to vote for it; but it certainly is quite a change in the existing law in some respects; it is accepted by the chairman of the committee; and if Senators want an opportunity to examine it over night, I think they ought to have it. I ask, therefore, that the further consideration of the amendment may be postponed for the present.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will consent to that, unless it should turn out that the bill is to be disposed of this evening. In that case I should like to have the amendment come up.

Mr. CHANDLER. There will be other amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand from the Senator from South Carolina that there are other amendments. I suggest that the other amendments, whatever they are, be disposed of to-night, if practicable, and then if everything else is concluded except the amendment of my colleague, the bill can be reported to the Senate, and the amendment can be acted upon to-morrow.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. ALLISON. In that way we will facilitate the consideration of the bill, and the amendment will take but a brief time to-morrow, because there will be ample opportunity to examine this statute. I have looked into it at the desk and think there is nothing difficult in applying the provisions of the statute of 1895 to dairy products. That course will facilitate the consideration of the bill, and it will require very little time to-morrow, if Senators find it necessary to make the examination during the night.

Mr. TILLMAN. It will be perfectly satisfactory to me, provided we are given time to examine into the matter.

Mr. ALLISON. The bill will be open to amendment, to be offered in the Senate, if we conclude the bill to-night, with the exception of that particular amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to laying aside the amendment temporarily? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KYLE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Vermont, a question. It relates to page 12, the subject under consideration. What provision is made by the bill for the republication of the valuable work known as the Diseases of the Horse, and also the Diseases of Cattle and of Sheep?

Mr. PROCTOR. No provision has been made in the bill. I think those republications have generally been made by resolutions. I hardly think it is necessary to incorporate such a provision in the bill. As far as my recollection goes, there has been no objection whenever it has been proposed, and it has been done by resolution.

Mr. KYLE. A resolution referred to the Committee on Printing?

Mr. PROCTOR. I am not sure as to the course the resolutions have taken, but I know they have gone through very promptly.

Mr. STEWART. Allow me to make a suggestion to the chairman of the committee and others in regard to the examination of dairy products when they are prepared for export. It is a very difficult matter and will be extremely costly. I do not think it can be done at the point of export. Many chemists have told me that they could not ascertain the deleterious matters which had entered into the product by an examination of the product, but that they would show themselves in the early decay of the product. Its keeping qualities were different. Cleanliness and care at the dairy are the only things that can produce a good product which will keep. The examination at the point of export will be almost inconsequential. I have been told by experts in regard to milk that you must have the examination, to be effective, at the dairy, at the farm; see that cleanliness is preserved there, because the deleterious matter will show itself in the completed product some time afterwards in its keeping qualities. It is a very wide subject and a very important one to have a complete examination of dairy products. It would not only be useful for exports, but it would be useful for the home consumption of those products. I have no objection to the making of such examination as can be made, but I want to suggest that a complete examination can not be made at the point of export, as you can with meat or something of that kind.

Mr. CAFFERY. I take it that what the Senator from Nevada says is true. Then the reason why Canadian butter has run American butter out of foreign markets is that the Canadians are more cleanly than the American people, and against that—

Mr. STEWART. I will state to the Senator that in almost all European countries they have a very rigid examination of the dairies, and it has become more and more rigid, and that enables them to produce a better article than those countries where it is not so examined. I do not know how it is in Canada—whether the strict rules of examination of dairy farms prevail there, as they do in all countries of Europe where they produce butter and cheese for export. Great attention has been paid to that subject recently. Canada may have done it.

The people of Canada are no more cleanly than the people of the United States, nor are the people of any country more cleanly than are those of the United States; but people engaged in producing dairy products in the United States and in every country are liable to get careless. Deleterious substances become mixed with the butter, and that deteriorates the whole lot. If they have any advantage over us in the markets, it is because they are more particular in having pure products to start with by inspection. Whether we can have it in this country or not I do not know. I hope we will have something more of it in this city, and get a purer quality of milk than we now have, because doctors and scientists who have given attention to the subject attribute a good deal of disease to the dairy products brought into the city without proper inspection, in order to secure cleanliness and the purity of the products.

Mr. CAFFERY. It occurs to me that the effect of this amendment will be to dump all the bad butter on the domestic consumer and to have all the good butter shipped to the foreign consumer. We have a great quantity of this bad butter, or there would be no use for the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. It seems that our foreign trade in butter has been imperiled by reason of the bad and indifferent butter which has been shipped to the foreign consumer. Now, there is a vast quantity of that shipped, according to the Secretary of Agriculture and according to this amendment, and I should like to know what we are going to do with the bad product. I rather think we ought to commence by protecting ourselves at home first, especially as I believe there is more butter consumed in the United States than we export to foreign countries.

I can not myself see why this amendment is urged upon us. I do not know that Canada has any inspection laws or that Norway has any inspection laws or that any other country that exports butter has inspection laws, but if they have I should like some Senator to inform me on that point. If our people are not honest enough to make good butter to be shipped abroad, they are certainly not honest enough to make good butter for us to keep at home.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No amendment is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. MONEY. On page 38, line 6, I move to strike out the words "one clerk" and insert "three clerks," and in the next line to strike out "five" and insert "three." It does not change the number, but transposes the clerks from one class to another class. I will say that the increase will be but \$400 in salaries. In line 8 I move to strike out the words "(one of whom shall be a stenographer)" and to insert after the word "dollars," in line 7, the words "(one of whom may be a stenographer)." I polled the committee, and I find that all but one are favorable to the amendment. I will also state to the Senate that I had a visit to-day from the chief who is interested in this matter. Both of these clerks are ladies. One of them has been for twelve or fifteen years at the head of a division of 27 employees. She is doing work now for which a man would get a salary of eighteen hundred or two thousand dollars. She is an old lady. Her hair is as white as snow. I find that she is exceedingly efficient and faithful, and is most highly commended by the Secretary, the chief clerk, her own chief, and everybody connected with the building.

The other is a lady, said to be of equal merit, who has been a stenographer and typewriter. Both of these ladies merit this little promotion, and it will be gratifying to the Department and promotive of the general interest if the amendment can be adopted. As the committee seemed willing to agree to it, I ask the Senator to adopt the amendment. It is an increase of only \$400.

Mr. GALLINGER. What does it accomplish for this old lady?

Mr. MONEY. It simply transposes the ladies from one class to another; from \$1,000 to \$1,200. It does not increase the number of clerks. It only increases the sum total \$400. It is a promotion which they merit by their labors there.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then why do they not get it in the ordinary course?

Mr. MONEY. Because it has not been adopted by the Senate. I hope to have it done now, and I hope to have the assistance of my distinguished friend the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I can not resist such an appeal. Nevertheless, I will venture to say that I think we are entering upon a long road if we commence legislating in favor of individual clerks on appropriation bills. This bill is full of general legislation of every conceivable kind, and if now we commence to increase the salaries of individual clerks in the bill, I do not know where it will end.

Mr. MONEY. I will say to the Senator that I will, for his satisfaction, stop right with these two.

Mr. GALLINGER. But some other Senator will know an old lady or a young lady for whom he will desire a promotion.

Mr. MONEY. I wish to say that I have no interest whatever in this old lady. I do not know from what State she comes, or anything about her, except her character as a clerk and her necessities. I know, furthermore, that she deserves this money. She has done work for which a man would be paid \$1,800, and I do not think work ought to have any sex when it comes to payment. I do hope the Senate will grant this promotion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 6, page 38, it is proposed to strike out the words "one clerk" and insert "three clerks;" after the word "dollars," in line 7, to insert "(one of whom may be a stenographer);" in line 7, to strike out "five" and insert "three" before the word "clerks;" and line 8 to strike out "(one of whom shall be a stenographer);" so as to read:

Three clerks at \$1,200 (one of whom may be a stenographer); three clerks at \$1,000 each.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I suppose in this condition of the Senate the amendment will pass. Therefore I want, before a vote is taken upon it, to call attention to the fact that I shall vote against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. TELLER. Let us hear what the amendment is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will again be stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the yeas have it.

Mr. MONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator to call for a division rather than for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MONEY. I will withdraw the demand for the yeas and nays, and withdraw the amendment, if the chairman of the committee thinks I had better let it go. If it is in order, however, I should like to express my regret that the Senate has taken this stand. I have no interest whatever in these ladies. I do not know where they come from, but I know the character of work they perform.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the clause of the bill, on page 28, beginning in line 10 and going to the bottom of the page, seems not to have received fully the attention that it deserves, and I desire to make a few comments upon it. By looking on the previous page it will be seen that this part of the bill concerns the Bureau of Chemistry, and that the item of appropriation which is particularly being set forth on this page is with respect to the general expenses of the Bureau of Chemistry. The last precedent line of the appropriation says:

To investigate the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors, when deemed by the Secretary of Agriculture advisable.

Then comes the clause to which I refer, which goes on to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he has reason to believe that articles are being imported from some foreign country—

Mr. MALLORY. I rise to a point of order. There is so much noise that I can not hear the Senator from Virginia, though I am near him.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say that we in this part of the Chamber are not hearing anything of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. DANIEL. The particular phraseology of the bill that I am now referring to is that—

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator will begin anew. We over here do not know what he has been talking about.

Mr. DANIEL. I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that in that part of the bill which provides for the general expenses of the Bureau of Chemistry, and as an addition to the language of the appropriation for the purpose of investigating the adulteration of foods, drugs, and liquors, is a clause which relates to the importation of articles into this country, which, in effect, is a prohibitory bill, a penal bill, and a thorough extrajudicial determination of the subject. That is to say, it goes on to provide:

And the Secretary of Agriculture, whenever he has reason to believe that articles are being imported from foreign countries which are dangerous to the health of the people of the United States, shall make a request upon the Secretary of the Treasury for samples from original packages of such articles for inspection and analysis; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to open such original packages and deliver specimens to the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose mentioned, giving notice to the owner or consignee of such articles, who may be present and have the right to introduce testimony; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall refuse delivery to the consignee of any such goods which the Secretary of Agriculture reports to him have been inspected and analyzed and found to be dangerous to health.

Mr. President, if we are going to legislate on this subject the appropriate method of legislating, as it would seem to me, would be to pass a penal statute against the importation of such articles into this country, and to provide due process of law for the determination of the fact as to the nature of the articles when that question is raised.

This is a sidelong method, an artificial method, an unscientific method of ingrafting a penal statute with respect to importations into the country upon an appropriation bill for the benefit of agriculture. The articles which may be imported are not necessarily agricultural articles. They may be any kind of articles which are injurious to health, and there is no method of procedure provided in the prohibition of those articles for the testing of the question and for the disposition of the goods. It is simply provided that the goods shall be held and not delivered, which is, of course, a provision in the nature of a penalty.

In short, Mr. President, it does not seem to me that this is good legislation. It will unquestionably lead to some sort of judicial procedure to get people out of the difficulties that it involves them in. But it is alien to the purposes of this bill. It has no element of appropriation in it. It belongs to the draftsman of laws for the general regulation of importations into the country rather than to the function of an appropriations committee, or to the method adopted by that committee for the handling of this topic. It seems to me that it is subversive of personal right. No trial is provided, and no method of trial is provided.

The provision ends by saying that the goods shall not be delivered. What is to become of them? Are they to be sent back; and if so, at whose expense? If they stay here, who is to pay the expense of storage? If they are to be dumped into the sea or set fire to as things which are hostis humani generis, who is to do it? There is no judge or executioner. The subject is left in the air. It seems to me, Mr. President, this provision ought to be stricken out of the bill, and if it is not too late to do so I make the point of order against it as general legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is late with his point of order. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

Mr. DANIEL. I move to strike it out.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is precisely the language of the present law.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, we are so careless in ingrafting laws on appropriation bills that I have no doubt precedents for any kind of eccentricity or error can be found without number amongst them. Congress is so crowded with measures that it is very difficult to give that minute and particular attention to phraseology which is essential to good lawmaking, and, therefore, when attention is called to it, the objections ought to be reasonably and fully answered or the matter ought to be thrown out of an appropriation bill with which it has no appropriate concern.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DANIEL. With pleasure.

Mr. PROCTOR. I wish to call his attention to the fact that this was very fully discussed the other day when the bill was under consideration and an amendment was made in line 9 by inserting after the word "which" the words "by reason of such adulteration," and at the close of the provision, after the word "health," by inserting the words "because of such adulteration."

Mr. DANIEL. I was well aware of that, Mr. President; but that amendment was a mere change of phraseology, to meet some criticism of the word "dangerous." What is adulteration and what is dangerous? If you ask those questions you may answer them until to-morrow without reaching a satisfactory conclusion. They are matters of judicial ascertainment; and certainly the opinion of an executive officer of this Government, certainly the mere fact that one man in the Government considered the property of a citizen to be dangerous or considered it to be adulterated property ought not to preclude that man, without judge, jury, process, or hearing, from the proper methods of self-defense.

I move, Mr. President, to strike out the words of the bill beginning with the word "and," in line 10 on page 28, and going to the bottom of the page.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's amendment is not in order now, but will be in order when the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. It was distinctly understood that we were to move any amendments to the bill when we got through with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was not informed of that understanding.

Mr. TELLER. That was distinctly understood.

Mr. DANIEL. That was my impression.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Virginia is strictly in order at the present time.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, if my motion is in order—

Mr. TELLER. It is.

Mr. DANIEL. It is my impression that there was that agreement about this bill. I will say only a few words more about it. I do not wish to detain the Senate from voting, but it is clear to my mind and conception of this amendment that it is an amendment which will lead to, rather than avoid, difficulties. Of course if a consignee has his goods libeled, so to speak, by an executive officer of the Government, and steps up and says, "You shall not have them," he will take some judicial procedure, it may be, to get them; but unless he take such procedure his goods are lost to him, not by an ex parte procedure of the Government in a legal sense, not under the superintendence of a judicial eye even in his absence, but by a mere executive regulation for the conduct of a Cabinet officer here in Washington. The ipse dixit of that Cabinet officer condemns a man's property, and unless he be at hand instantly to defend himself in such a way as he may his property is lost to him and his investment perishes.

I do not believe that any such statute ought to be on our statute book. It is derogatory to the rights of free citizenship and to orderly and appropriate judicial procedure of condemnation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to ask the Senator from Colorado what the unanimous-consent agreement was?

Mr. TELLER. The unanimous-consent agreement was just as we have had it in one or two other instances, that the committee amendments should be first considered and then the whole bill would be open to any amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado understand that that unanimous-consent agreement extends to amendments which had been agreed to?

Mr. TELLER. It did distinctly.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is my recollection, Mr. President.

Mr. TELLER. It was that we would have a right to move to amend the bill as we desired.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There is no question about that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia moves to amend by striking out what the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. On page 28, line 10, after the word "advisable," at the beginning of the line, strike out all down to and including line 24 at the bottom of the page.

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Virginia, if what he says is true, that this amounts to a condemnation of a man's property without due process of law, whether that condemnation does not come under the prohibition of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution, and that the committee amendment is in that respect unconstitutional?

Mr. DANIEL. That is my impression about it.

Mr. CAFFERY. It occurs to me to be a very dangerous error, even setting aside any question of its constitutionality, to lodge in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Treasury. It appears from the wording of this amendment that the Secretary of Agriculture advises the Secretary of the Treasury that certain packages of goods have been imported from abroad which he supposes to be adulterated goods, and he obtains permission then from the Secretary of the Treasury to open the packages. They are opened, and he passes judgment upon them. He either says that they are good articles or that they are adulterated.

Now, that is a condemnation of the property of the consignee, presumably an American citizen, without due process of law, and in that particular I think it is unconstitutional. Even if it were not I would not be willing to permit any head of a Department to exercise such an unlimited authority. Even if it were constitutional, and I think it is clearly unconstitutional, then the consignee of these goods, upon the question of their adulteration, should be entitled to a judicial hearing and be allowed to prove his side of the case and to establish, if he could, that the goods were not adulterated.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the Senate has taken a vote to take a recess at half past 5 o'clock, and I therefore move an executive session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will withhold his motion, that the Chair may lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

NORTH ATLANTIC SQUADRON.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

During our recent war with Spain the United States naval force on the North Atlantic Station was charged with varied and important duties, chief among which were the maintenance of the blockade of Cuba, aiding the Army, and landing troops and in subsequent operations, and particularly in the pursuit, blockade, and destruction of the Spanish squadron under Admiral Cervera.

This naval campaign, embracing objects of wide scope and grave responsibilities, was conducted with great ability on the part of the commander in chief, and of the officers and enlisted men under his command. It culminated in the annihilation of the Spanish fleet in the battle of July 3, 1898, one of the most memorable naval engagements in history.

The result of this battle was the freeing of our Atlantic coast from the possibilities to which it had been exposed from Admiral Cervera's fleet, and the termination of the war upon the seas.

I recommend that, following our national precedents, especially that in the case of Admiral Dewey and the Asiatic Squadron, the thanks of Congress be given to Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, United States Navy, and to the officers and men under his command for highly distinguished conduct in conflict with the enemy, and in carrying on the blockade and naval campaign on the Cuban coast, resulting in the destruction of the Spanish fleet at Santiago de Cuba July 3, 1898.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 14, 1901.

CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 8th instant, a copy of Major-General MacArthur's proclamation outlining a more rigid policy, dated Manila, Philippine Islands, December 30, 1900, and stating that Major-General MacArthur's report in relation to conditions in the Philippines is already printed, and also that no criticism by A. Mabini of Major-General MacArthur's proclamation has been received by the War Department; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After thirteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CATHEDRAL FOUNDATION.

Mr. KEAN. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3481) to permit certain burials of the dead in the lands of the Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the

District of Columbia, and for other purposes. The bill was called up and objected to some time ago, but the objection is withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is afraid the Senator will be interrupted by the arrival of the hour for taking a recess.

Mr. CHANDLER. The bill has been read.

Mr. KEAN. It has been read.

Mr. CARTER. The bill has been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill he has indicated. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.). The Senate will take a recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

The Senate thereupon took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9835) to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 15, 1901, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1901.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TWENTY-EIGHTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. Louis E. Shucker, Company E, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 12, 1901, vice Young, resigned.

FORTY-THIRD INFANTRY.

Com. Sergt. William O. Trenor, Forty-third Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 12, 1901, vice Price, promoted.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Q. M. Sergt. John A. Bassett, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 12, 1901, vice Hincken, killed in action.

FORTY-SEVENTH INFANTRY.

Sergt. William E. Roberts, Company H, Forty-seventh Infantry, to be second lieutenant, February 12, 1901, vice Harrison, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS AS MEDICAL OFFICERS OF VOLUNTEERS.

To be assistant surgeons of volunteers with the rank of captain.

Isaac W. Brewer, of Kansas (captain and assistant surgeon, Thirty-sixth Infantry, United States Volunteers), February 12, 1901.

Ernest H. Wheeler, of Maine (late assistant surgeon, First Maine Volunteer Infantry), February 12, 1901.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of first lieutenant.

John Dixon Yost, of Massachusetts (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

Charles Ransom Reynolds, of New York (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

Paul C. Hutton, of North Carolina (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

Frederick Allport Dale, of Pennsylvania (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

William Miller Roberts, of Maryland (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

Charles William Farr, of New York (acting assistant surgeon, United States Army), February 11, 1901.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be quartermaster with the rank of major.

Capt. John B. Bellinger, assistant quartermaster, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be majors.

Capt. James B. Hickey, Eighth Cavalry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Edward J. McClernand, Second Cavalry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Levi P. Hunt, Tenth Cavalry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Cunliffe H. Murray, Fourth Cavalry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Charles A. Varnum, Seventh Cavalry, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be major.

Capt. Alfred C. Sharpe, Twenty-second Infantry, February 2, 1901, vice Chance, Fifth Infantry, promoted.

QUARTERMASTER'S DEPARTMENT.

To be quartermasters with the rank of major.

Capt. Robert R. Stevens, assistant quartermaster, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

Capt. Frederick G. Hodgson, assistant quartermaster, February 2, 1901, to fill an original vacancy.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Rear-Admiral John A. Howell.

Rear-Admiral Winfield Scott Schley, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Rear-Admiral William T. Sampson when advanced.

Capt. Robley D. Evans, to be advanced five numbers in rank, and to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Rear-Admiral Charles S. Cotton.

Capt. Henry C. Taylor, to be advanced five numbers in rank, and to be a rear-admiral in the Navy, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Rear-Admiral John J. Read.

Capt. Francis A. Cook, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Capt. William C. Wise.

Capt. Charles E. Clark, to be advanced six numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Capt. Francis A. Cook when advanced.

Capt. Charles D. Sigsbee, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank on the list of captains next after George W. Melville, rear-admiral while Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering.

Capt. French E. Chadwick, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Capt. Benjamin P. Lamberton.

Capt. John J. Hunker, to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Capt. Charles S. Sperry.

Commander Chapman C. Todd, to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, and to be at the head of the list of commanders.

Commander William T. Swinburne to be advanced two numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Henry N. Manney.

Commander John D. Ford to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Henry B. Mansfield.

Commander Alexander B. Bates, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Leavitt C. Logan.

Commander Robert W. Milligan, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Charles O. Allibone.

Commander Richard Inch, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Edward D. Taussig.

Commander Charles W. Rae, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander George W. Baird.

Commander Adolph Marix, to be advanced two numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander George H. Kearny.

Commander Raymond P. Rodgers, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Adolph Marix when advanced.

Commander Seaton Schroeder, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Royal R. Ingersoll.

Commander Richard Wainright, to be advanced ten numbers

in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Duncan Kennedy.

Commander John A. Rodgers, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Edwin K. Moore.

Commander James K. Cogswell, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander James D. Adams.

Commander Frederic Singer, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander James K. Cogswell when advanced.

Commander William P. Potter, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Ebenezer S. Prime.

Commander Giles B. Harber, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Nathan E. Niles.

Commander John B. Briggs, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Giles B. Harber when advanced.

Commander Newton E. Mason, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander John B. Briggs when advanced.

Commander George P. Colvocoresses, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander John C. Wilson.

Commander John A. Norris, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Commander Richard G. Davenport.

Lieut. Commander Warner B. Bayley, to be advanced two numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Kossuth Niles.

Lieut. Commander Edward M. Hughes, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Albert F. Dixon.

Lieut. Commander Corwin P. Rees, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander George L. Dyer.

Lieut. Commander Albert C. Dillingham, to be advanced two numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Hugo Osterhaus.

Lieut. Commander Aaron Ward, to be advanced two numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Jacob J. Hunker.

Lieut. Commander Lucien Young, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Edward F. Qualtrough.

Lieut. Commander George B. Ransom, to be advanced three numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander John C. Colwell.

Lieut. Commander James M. Helm, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Henry T. Cleaver.

Lieut. Commander Cameron McK. Winslow, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Albert B. Willits.

Lieut. Commander Alexander Sharp, jr., to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander William G. Cutler.

Lieut. Commander Frank H. Bailey, to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander Wythe M. Parks.

Lieut. Commander Benjamin Tappan, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander John T. Newton.

Lieut. Commander Reynold T. Hall, to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Commander William S. Hogg.

Lieut. George W. McElroy, to be advanced three numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Roy C. Smith.

Lieut. Harry McL. P. Huse, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. William L. Rodgers.

Lieut. Carl W. Jungen, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. John Hood.

Lieut. Charles H. Harlow, to be advanced two numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Charles C. Marsh.

Lieut. John L. Purcell, to be advanced two numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. George R. Salisbury.

Lieut. Edwin A. Anderson, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. William B. Whittelsey.

Lieut. Victor Blue, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Ford H. Brown.

Lieut. Thomas P. Magruder, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Benjamin F. Hutchison.

Lieut. Cleland N. Offley, to be advanced four numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. George B. Bradshaw.

Lieut. William H. Buck, to be advanced eight numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Warren J. Terhune.

Lieut. Harry H. Caldwell, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. John H. Rowen.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Henry H. Ward, to be advanced ten numbers in rank and to be a lieutenant from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. Patrick W. Hourigan.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Walter S. Crosley, to be advanced two numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward H. Campbell.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Andre M. Procter, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank B. Upham.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William P. Scott, to be advanced five numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) Ernest L. Bennett.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Joseph M. Reeves, to be advanced four numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) William P. Scott when advanced.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Frank Lyons, to be advanced four numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) Leland F. James.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) James P. Morton, to be advanced four numbers in rank, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Lieut. (Junior Grade) Charles K. Mallory.

Ensign William R. White, to be advanced five numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Ensign Alfred W. Pressey.

Paymaster William W. Galt, to be advanced one number in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, and to take rank next after Paymaster Charles W. Littlefield.

Naval Constructor Richmond P. Hobson, to be advanced ten numbers in rank from the 11th day of February, 1901, and to be a naval constructor with the rank of captain, to take rank next after Naval Constructor Joseph H. Linnard.

Rear-Admiral James Entwistle, retired, to be advanced two numbers in rank, on the retired list, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Rear-Admiral Nicoll Ludlow, retired.

Chief Engineer Charles J. MacConnell, retired, to be advanced one number in rank on the retired list, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank at the head of chief engineers on the retired list, holding the rank of captain, retired in accordance with the provisions of section 1453 of the Revised Statutes.

Capt. John L. Hannum, retired, to be advanced two numbers in rank, on the retired list, from the 11th day of February, 1901, to take rank next after Capt. Henry B. Seely, retired.

Capt. George Cowie, retired, to be advanced three numbers in rank, on the retired list, to take rank next after Capt. John R. Bartlett, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Charles L. McCawley, to be a major in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

Capt. Allan C. Kelton, to be a major in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

First Lieut. James E. Mahoney, to be a captain in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

First Lieut. Herbert L. Draper, to be a captain in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

First Lieut. Charles G. Long, to be a captain in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

First Lieut. Albert S. McLemore, to be a captain in the Marine

Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

First Lieut. William N. McKelvy, to be a captain in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

Second Lieut. Melville J. Shaw, to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, by brevet, from the 11th day of June, 1898, for distinguished conduct and public service in the presence of the enemy at Guantanamo, Cuba.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 14, 1901.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE SERVICE.

John Boedeker, of Massachusetts, to be a third lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE SERVICE.

First Lieut. Albert Buhner, of South Carolina, to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Lieut. Eben Barker, of Massachusetts, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

Third Asst. Engineer William V. Sullivan, jr., of Mississippi, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 14, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LIGHT AND FOG STATION AT POINT DUME, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CAL.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5364) to establish a light and fog station at Point Dume, Los Angeles County, Cal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a Senate bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be established at Point Dume, Los Angeles County, Cal., a suitable light and fog-signal station, at a cost not to exceed \$63,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we should like to have some explanation of this measure. I see the two able champions of the people here, representing the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY]. I call attention to this \$63,000 expenditure.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, Point Dume is at the head of Santa Monica Bay, at its northern extremity. There is a great commerce that enters that bay at the present time. During the past year no less than 296 ocean steamers passed that point. The 20-fathom curve comes to within a mile of that point, and, as is very frequently the case on the California coast, there is a large fog belt that extends along that coast. It is a point at which the Light-House Board have recommended that a light-house and fog-signal station be established. There is no fog-signal station at that point or within 25 miles of either side of that point. There is no other light-house visible from that point, and in consequence of the large commerce that enters that bay I sincerely hope that the House will grant consent that this light-house may be established.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one word. I am not inclined to object to the consideration of this bill. While I do not know much of its merits, it is true that with the ten or fifteen thousand miles of coast line of the United States many light-houses are called for. Some are recommended as indispensable, others as necessary, others as desirable. I do not know whether this belongs to the first, the second, or the third class. It is within the jurisdiction exercised by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I take it for granted from the statement of the gentleman that there is a high grade of necessity for the erection of a light at this point. In any event, it is in the class of cases where I am under the impression that it is recognized as indispensable, and I am strong enough in that impression not to object; but if unanimous consent should be given to consider it, then it is open for consid-

eration on the merits. Of course one objection will kill it now, whereas a majority will be required to pass it in the event of consent being given.

Mr. MADDOX. If the gentleman will permit me, is it not a fact that we have provided for several already by unanimous consent?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; and I want to say, touching that point—I want to be fair with the House, because as these matters involve large expenditures and are passed in an extraordinary way, namely, by unanimous consent instead of by discussion in Committee of the Whole—I believe every bill that passes ought to be scrutinized as closely as possible, because they necessitate an extraordinary expenditure of money. Now, from the little information I can get, I am inclined to believe that this is one of the class that might be styled absolutely necessary.

Mr. GAINES. Where is it to be located?

Mr. CANNON. I believe it is at the harbor of Santa Monica.

Mr. KAHN. It is at the northern extremity of Santa Monica Bay, California.

Mr. GAINES. How far from San Francisco?

Mr. KAHN. It is about 250 miles from San Francisco.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to taking the Senate bill from the Speaker's table and considering it now?

Mr. McRAE. I should like to ask if this bill has been reported favorably by any committee?

Mr. KAHN. It has the unanimous report of the House committee, and it has already passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KAHN, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the corresponding House bill was ordered to lie on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVER AT GENEVA, ALA.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read. It provides that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, a corporation created and existing under the laws of the State of Kentucky, and doing business in the State of Alabama, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala., at such point as may have been or may hereafter be selected by said railroad company for crossing said river on its line of railroad, provided such point selected shall, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be suitable to the interests of navigation; that said bridge shall be constructed for the passage of railroad trains, and said railroad company may locate, construct, maintain, and operate over said bridge and the approaches thereto railroad tracks for the use of said railroad company.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BERRY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD LAND GRANT.

Mr. EDDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 4306) for the relief of settlers under the public-land laws to lands within the indemnity limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of July 1, 1898, appearing in 30 Statutes at Large, at pages 620, 621, and 622, providing a plan for the adjustment by the Land Department of conflicting claims to lands within the limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, are hereby extended and made applicable to all instances where lands in odd-numbered sections within the indemnity limits of the grant to said company were patented to settlers under the public-land laws subsequent to August 15, 1887, and prior to July 1, 1898, in pursuance of applications presented to or proceedings initiated in the local land office at a time when the land was included within an existing Executive withdrawal on account of said grant or at a time when it was embraced in a pending indemnity selection made by said company in conformity with the regulations of the Land Department, which indemnity selection has not since been waived or abandoned.

The following committee amendment was read:

After the word "abandoned," in line 7, page 2, strike out all of lines 8, 9, and 10.